

The Classical Review

MARCH 1888.

PHILOLOGICAL NOTES.

I.

For many years it has been generally acknowledged that the terminations of the imperfect *om*, *es*, *et* (in Greek *ov*, *es*, *ε*; in Sanscrit *am*, *as*, *at*) are prior to those of the present. In Sanscrit the mode of formation is obvious—viz. by the addition of *i*, *āmi*, *asi*, *ati*. The only difficulty lies in the length of the vowel of the 1st person. This is accounted for if we make the assumption, which for other reasons is a probable one, that the original termination of the 1st person of the imperfect was *ōm*. By a law of Indo-European *sandhi* *-ōm* would be shortened before all words beginning with a consonant, and the shorter form conquered in the struggle for existence. Great ingenuity has been brought to bear in the task of identifying the Greek *ω*, *εσ*, *ε*, and the Sanscrit *āmi*, *asi*, *ati*: but the effort has been at last generally abandoned, and philologists are content with saying that, as the Sanscrit language uses the suffix *i*, so the Greek uses the same letter as an infix in the 2nd and 3rd persons. It has not hitherto been noticed, I think, that the same infixed *i* gives rise to the *ω* of the 1st person: *ov* with infixed *i* gives *oiv*, which by the rules of Greek phonology could appear in no other form than that of *oia*, and this after *i* ceased to be a Greek sound becomes *oa*, and *ω*. Cf. *δεῖδω* = *δεῖδοα*, the sing. of *δεῖδμεν*.

If this theory be correct, and *ω* in the Greek present is due to the special laws of Greek phonology, it follows that the *o* in the Latin present must have a different history. I believe, though the evidence I produce is not conclusive, that the *o* is merely a Latin transformation of *ōm*. It is an established doctrine that the Latin present is identical in form with the unaugmented Sanscrit and Greek imperfect. No trace of the present-forming *i* (except in the discredited *tremonti*)

or of the temporal augment is to be found in Latin. It might indeed be contended that the *i* had dropped in the Latin active, but the terminations of the present medio-passive are conclusive against this view. *Legitur* and *leguntur* are, as Westphal has pointed out, constructed by the addition of the passive *r* from medial forms answering to the Sanscrit and Greek imperfect, viz., *legeto-r*, *legonto-r*; and it is unquestionable, that *sequere*, whether imperative or indicative, corresponds precisely to (*ἐπεσσο*) *ἔπον*, the unaugmented Greek imperfect. All this agrees with Wackernagel's brilliant discovery that the unaugmented imperfect is the primitive verbal form of the Indo-European language, and could be used as present or past indicative, or as injunctive or future, differentiated partly as we can see by prefixes and suffixes, partly as we may suppose by accent, position in sentences, &c. The *o* of the Latin present, as I said before, belongs to the primitive (so-called secondary) formation, and stands for *ōm*. That *m* remained a present termination for some time during the separate existence of the Latin language is a position supported not only by the endings of the subjunctive present (*regam*, etc.), but by the existence of *sum*. The only satisfactory explanation of the form *sum* (*sumus*, *sunt*) is that it answers to the Ionic *ζων*, and stands for *esōm*, both the dropping of the initial *e* and the shortening being due to the use of the word as an enclitic, the use with which we are familiar in the case of *es* and *est* in later Latin. I cannot adduce any direct evidence that *m* is dropped in Latin after *o*, but the existence of such a law would agree with forms like *ratio*, etc.

We have the emphatic *esom*, *esomus*, *esont*, represented by *ero*, *erimus*, *erunt*. *Eris*, *erit*, *eritis*, would be on this view analogical later formations. The earlier Latin pro-

bably used in their place *escis, escit, escitis*. At any rate I can find no trace of *erit* in the archaic language.

II.

If we confine our view to the Latin and Greek languages, no one would hesitate to identify the endings of the Greek aorist with those of the perfect. In all the persons but the 3rd plural this is obvious, nor is it difficult there. The usual *πεφύασι* (*πεφυσαντι*), deprived of the *ι*, which is symbolic apparently of a present tense, gives the exact form required. The identity of the terminations explains why in Latin the aorist and perfect combined into one tense, a result which on the reigning theory is unintelligible. In fact the identification of *scripsen* with *scripsi* is an effort of philological despair. But neither is there anything in Sanscrit which forbids us to identify the two sets of terminations. The truth is that Sanscrit has travelled along another path, and has given all its aorists in the main the terminations of the imperfect.

III.

What is the termination of the 3rd plural of the Greek perfect? The answer is to be found in *οἶδα*, which seems to have remained true throughout to the earlier type of formation. *ἴσασι* for *ἴδσαντι* implies an original *ἴδσι*, lengthened after the analogy of *ἴασι* and *ἴασι*. In the Homeric form *πεφύκασι* we have the same termination with the same intrusive *α* as in the 1st and 2nd persons plural, the typical form being *πεφυξί*. In *πεφύασι* for *πεφυσάσι* (*πεφυσαντι*) we have the same lengthening as in *ἴσασι*, the *σ* being dropped between two vowels. The later *πεφύκασι* is the result of the contamination of the two forms.

Latin starting with the same termination has followed much the same course: *videre* (for *φοῖδασι*, *vidase*) has lengthened into *videront*.

The only objection I can see to this view is the form *ἐθώκατι* quoted by Hesychius. I believe it is a later formation due to the metrical exigencies of some Doric poet who extracted *ἐθώκατι* from *ἐθωκαντι* on the supposed analogy of *πεφύκασι* from *πεφύκασι*.

F. W. WALKER.

(To be continued.)

REVIEWS.

LORD JUSTICE BOWEN'S *VIRGIL*.

Virgil, in English verse, Eclogues and Aeneid I.—VI. By the Right Hon. SIR CHARLES BOWEN, one of her Majesty's Lord Justices of Appeal, once Fellow and now Visitor of Balliol College, Oxford, F.R.S., Hon. D.C.L. of the University of Oxford. 12s.

LORD JUSTICE BOWEN fulfils the two chief conditions of a successful translation, fidelity to his original and the production of a work of literary art, as completely as any recent translator from an ancient or foreign language. To say that he has been absolutely successful in a long and difficult undertaking, in which one of the great English poets of the past, and one of the best among recent English scholars, have obtained only a partial success, might perhaps be too much. But he combines in a higher degree than any of those who have previously attempted the task the two requisites of finished scholarship, and of power, versatility, and

delicacy in the use of language and metre. No one, however familiar with the language of Virgil, can compare passages in this English version, line by line and phrase by phrase, with the original, without apprehending much that was in the poet's mind which he had not perceived before, and without feeling his power and charm with a new enjoyment. The exact and refined scholarship of the translator shows itself in the minute carefulness of his workmanship, and his fidelity to the subtle suggestions and shades of meaning in the original. But to accurate scholarship and critical appreciation he adds the lively susceptibility, the mobility of mind and imagination, the affluence of language, and the power, ease, and tact in its employment, characteristic of a literary artist; and with these gifts of a poetic temperament he combines acuteness and soundness of judgment derived from the education of a great practical career. This translation may be read with pleasure for

its own sake by people of cultivation who may have forgotten or have never made any acquaintance with the original, and is more likely to attract them to Virgil and to make them feel something of his spell than any previous translation. Those who have formed an idea of Virgil's *Eclogues* as somewhat tame specimens of the artificial pastoral fashionable in the last century, may realize in this version their dramatic vivacity and the living human interest which pervades them. Those who may have thought of the *Aeneid* as an imitative epic, rendered original by the sense of Roman dignity and imperial greatness animating some passages of it, may feel through this medium the fascination of the poem as a tale of heroic adventure and human sensibility.

But to attain an ideal success as a translator of Virgil something more is needed than a faithful reproduction of the meaning of the original, executed with great literary skill and vivacity. The poetical quality of Virgil depends largely on his manner, and on the fusion of the meaning with the music of his language. No previous translator in verse succeeds in reproducing, even approximately, this manner. Dryden's translation is a monument of the English language in the stage, not indeed of its freshest youth, but of its lustiest vigour, and is a witness to the power of the verse to which he himself imparted so much of English strength, fervour, and dignity. But while this verse, in his hands and in the hands of Johnson, represents adequately enough the Roman strength, fervour, and dignity of the Hexameter of Juvenal, its general effect is as remote as possible from that of the delicate and intricate harmony of Virgil's verse, as remote as is the masculine temper of Dryden from the beauty and majesty of Virgil's nature. Mr. Morris's version of *The Aeneids of Virgil* has a poetical quality of its own; but he is not to be compared with either Conington or Sir C. Bowen as a scholarly interpreter of Virgil's language; and the archaic quaintness of a medieval romance is as different as it well can be from the thoroughly modern subtlety and cultivated refinement of Virgilian expression. The merits and defects of Conington's experiment in the metre and manner of Scott are generally recognized. He reproduces the rapid movement and romance of a poem of action and adventure, the martial spirit, and the sense of patriotic associations in connexion with the picturesque features of the land, which Scott shares with Virgil. Though his metre wants the massiveness of Roman workmanship, and

the stateliness of Roman manners, yet it is capable of imitating the sententiousness and the *imperatoria brevis* which are characteristically Roman. But it is true, as is said in his preface by Lord Justice Bowen, who pays a just tribute of respect to the scholarship and the literary art of Conington, that from his version 'the sweet and solemn majesty of the ancient form is wholly gone;' and this from no failure in appreciation or in power of execution, but from the unfitness of the vehicle employed by him. The difference between the manner of Virgil and the manner of Scott was illustrated, at the time when Conington's translation appeared, by the juxtaposition of the stately words in which Juno asserts her state as Queen of Heaven,—

'Ast ego quae divom incedo regina,'

and the bluff directness, not without a rude dignity of its own, in which the Highland cateran asserts his sense of his own importance,—

'And, Saxon, I am Rhoderick Dhu.'

The answer to the question whether Lord Justice Bowen has succeeded in reproducing approximately the manner and poetical quality of Virgil, will depend on the opinion formed of the fitness or unfitness to represent the Virgilian line of a new experiment in metre suggested by the partial success of Clough, Kingsley, and Longfellow, in their attempt to popularize the English hexameter. The modification in the hexameter introduced by Sir C. Bowen is the omission of the final syllable and the employment of rhyme, generally though not always; in couplets. By both modifications the classical metre is more adapted to an English ear; but this advantage is gained by some sacrifice of strength; and if ever we feel any sense of weakness or irrelevance of expression in the otherwise finished workmanship of the translation, the exigences of the rhyme have, in a great measure, to answer for our disappointment. Yet the general effect of the verse grows on the reader the more he becomes familiar with it. Sir Charles is justified, by the success with which he manipulates it, in speaking of it as 'a powerful instrument susceptible of varied treatment, full of flexibility, capable of rising to real grandeur.' It cannot indeed do all, or nearly all, that the Latin hexameter does—the metre capable of such manifold effects as are recognized in the swelling and culminating grandeur of many passages in Lucretius, in the stately procession of lines in the epic

idyll of Catullus, in the vivacity and tender grace of movement in the *Eclogues*, the intricate harmonies of the *Aeneid*, the deep tranquil flow of the *Georgics*, the shallower but quiet and musical current of Horace's *Epistles*, and the turbid torrent of Juvenal's declamation. The verse is not the equivalent of the Latin hexameter. The loss of the last syllable deprives the line of strength and weight, where the Latin line is strongest and weightiest. The English language, as now spoken, with its disregard of quantitative distinctions and its employment of a number of small words to do the work of one long termination, moves naturally with much more rapidity than the ornate literary language of Rome. Thus the verse is too springy, too suggestive of hurry, to be an exact representative of the 'unhasting, un-resting' movement of the Virgilian epic. While it has the advantage over Dryden and Conington's verse, that it does not confine the sense within the couplet, and thus admits a greater variety of pauses, it falls far short of the Virgilian hexameter in the intricacy and variety of structure which it can give to long continuous passages. But in spite of these drawbacks the effect of the verse is a nearer approximation to that of the Virgilian hexameter than that of any verse hitherto employed. It has, if not the same weight and variety, similar amplitude and volume, and thus it has, as is claimed for it by its inventor, the great advantage of admitting of a linear translation. The metre reproduces, probably as well as any metre could do, the simpler, more lively and buoyant movement of the *Eclogues*. It can do justice not only to their softer cadences, but to the deeper tones which his sympathy with the grander voices of nature elicits from the poet,—

'Neither the whispering breath of the South wind,
now on its way,
Brings me a joy thus deep, nor the thunder of surf
on the shore,
Nor when the rock-strewn valley resounds to the
torrent's roar.'

A lover of Virgil who has not yet made himself acquainted with the translation might be advised to familiarize himself with the metre by first reading the version of the ninth *Eclogue*, justly characterized by the translator as the most 'delicate and complete of all Virgil's metrical dialogues.' The translation is as flawless in execution as a translation well can be, and as happy a reproduction of the graceful vivacity and of the deeper feeling of the original. He might

then turn to the preceding *Eclogue*, and read the songs of Damon and Alphesiboeus, with their refrains,—

'Begin, my flute of the Mountains, with me my
Maenalus strain,'

and

'Homeward bring from the city, my chants, bring
Daphnis again.'

If he is not satisfied with the closeness and fidelity to the original, the richness and flexibility of the translator's diction, and of the fitness of his metre to represent at least the *molle atque facetum* of Virgil's manner, one can only say that differences of taste and opinion on such a matter go deeper than one could have believed possible.

In regard to the *Aeneid*, both metre and manner are more fitted to do justice to it as a poem of heroic adventure, of human sensibility and passion, of descriptive power, of great finish and richness of detail, than as the expression of the imperial sentiment and character of Rome. The buoyant English metre seems scarcely so fit as that of Dryden and, perhaps, of Conington to imitate the massive grandeur of the line,—

'Tantae molis erat Romanam condere gentem,'

or to convey the proud sentiment of the passage,—

'Tu regere imperio populos' &c.

Yet lines like this in the prayer of Venus,—

'Yet thence were to rise in the ages afar,
Romans, rulers of men, great lords of the land and
the main,'

remind us of the imperial ring which is in the English language also. It may be noticed how much weight is added to some of the lines by the substitution of the spondee for the dactyl in the fifth foot, and it may be a matter for Sir Charles' consideration how far a larger employment of spondaic lines might meet the difficulty of reproducing the graver matter and manner of the *Georgics* in the metre which so happily renders the lightness and vivacity of the *Eclogues*.

The limits allowed to me permit only of one or two short quotations as specimens which may be compared with the versions of Dryden or Conington. The well known lines, iv. 625-629, *Exoriare aliquis* &c. are thus rendered in Sir Charles' sonorous and musical verse:—

'Rise! thou Nameless Avenger from Dido's ashes
to come,
Follow with fire and slaughter the false Dardanians
home!'

Smite them to-day, hereafter, through ages yet un-
explored,
Long as thy strength sustains thee, and fingers
cling to the sword!
Sea upon sea wage battle for ever! Shore upon
shore,
Spear upon spear! to the sires and the children
strife evermore.

Conington's version of the same passage, though powerful in its condensation, has neither the amplitude nor the majesty of Sir Charles's version, nor does it bring out with such vital energy every shade and suggestion of meaning in the original.

'Rise from my ashes, scourge of crime,
Born to pursue the Dardan horde,
To-day, to-morrow, through all time,
Oft as our hands can wield the sword.
Fight, shore with shore, fight sea with sea,
Fight all that are or e'er shall be.'

And while Conington is brief and meagre, as compared with Sir C. Bowen, Dryden is loose and careless. Or again, to take, almost at random, a few lines of description. How vividly the life and energy of a sea-landscape, or rather of two different sea-pieces, is reproduced in the version of v. 124-128:

'Far in the deep sea facing the foam-white shore is
a rock:
Ever, when stars are veiled and the northern hur-
ricane raves,
Drowned in the billows, and lashed by the thunder-
ing water shock;
Silent in summer weather, it springs from the
slumbering waves
Level and bare, and is haunted of sea-gulls loving
the sun.'

If there is a flaw here it is in the excess of energy imparted to the description by the rendering of *attollitur* by the words 'it springs.' The great excellence of the whole work is that it is thoroughly alive in every line. And what might be even a perilous excess of vitality is controlled by almost unerring taste and almost unerring scholarship. Probably many have found that their familiarity with the diction of Virgil and Horace at a time of life when their imagination could not reproduce their full meaning has for a long time afterwards somewhat deadened their sensibility to the vivid life concealed under their carefully meditated diction. They may recover this lost or neglected sensibility by taking Lord Justice Bowen as their interpreter.

One or two slight flaws may be noted as worth Sir Charles's reconsideration. Is the word 'braves' properly applied to the legendary heroes of a civilized people? Is not the word 'glower' only used in Scotch,

and then chiefly in a grim or humorous, not in a tragic connexion?¹ In the rustic poetry of the *Eclogues* the Scotch word 'burn' for 'brook' seems, on the other hand, quite appropriate. The exigencies of rhyme force upon the translator weak endings of lines, such as 'Dido the lorn,' 'Dido the sweet,' 'Dido the rich,' all within the same book. The effect of one of the lines of deepest feeling in one of the finest passages in Book VI. is marred by the omission to reproduce the picture suggested by the words *ante ora parentum*, for which the equivalent given is, 'before their fathers were dead.' One cannot resist the temptation of quoting the lines immediately succeeding, one of many instances in which Virgil's similes are rendered with Virgilian grace:—

'Many as forest leaves that in autumn's earliest
frost
Flutter and fall, or as birds that in beevies flock to
the coast,
Over the sea's deep hollows, when winter chilly
and froze
Drives them across far waters to land on a sunnier
shore.'

Both the beauty and the meaning of the passage—

'Hic manus ob patriam pugnando vulnera passi,' &c. are marred or obscured first by the use of the word 'braves,' though that perhaps is a question of taste, but certainly by the rendering of the words most expressive of Virgil's reverence for the art to which he had consecrated his life—*prii vates* as 'faithful prophets.' The prophet as represented by the word *vates* was no object of reverence to a cultivated Roman.² The word received its higher significance when employed by the Augustan poets, of whom Virgil was apparently the earliest so to use it (*Me quoque dicunt Vatem pastores*) to indicate the sanctity of their own calling. The *prii vates* of Virgil is surely to be interpreted by the *vate sacro* of Horace, and by the application to himself, in a passage of the deepest feeling, of the words *vatis amici*, and, in a passage

¹ e.g. in Burns's *Holy Fair*.

'As lightsomely I glow'd abroad,'

or as a substantive,—

'A greedy glowr Black Bonnet throws,
An' we maun draw our tippence.'

² The only passage in Virgil that might be supposed to justify this interpretation is *Æneid*, iv. 464, where some editors read *vatum praedicta piorum*, but Sir Charles's rendering, 'dire warnings from prophets of earlier years,' shows that he there prefers the imaginative mystery and the perfect relevance of the idea suggested by *priorum* to the otiose irrelevance of the other epithet.

of quieter feeling in the *Epistles*, of *vates tuus*.

Slight flaws, of which these are specimens, are scarcely perceptible in the general fidelity and beauty of the workmanship. They are mentioned not as detracting, in any degree worth mentioning, from the value of the book. But a translation, unlike an original poem, which is not always improved by 'adding and altering many times,' admits of an almost indefinite approach to perfection. One may wish Lord Justice Bowen many seasons of such leisure as he has so well employed, not only to complete his work,

but to make that which he has already accomplished even still more deserving of a permanent place in English literature. There can be no more happy or liberal employment of leisure for one who is at once a finished scholar and a true literary artist than thus to restore the *vita et spiritus* to the great writers of the past, to reveal them in a new light to those who knew them before, and to diffuse their influence over many to whom they would otherwise be a sealed book.

W. Y. SELLAR.

SCHMIDT'S CATULLUS.

C. Valeri Catulli Veronensis Carmina. BERNHARDUS SCHMIDT recognovit. Tauchnitz. Lipsiae. 1887. 4 Mk.

THIS latest edition of Catullus contains, besides the text of the poems, *prolegomena* and *apparatus criticus* of an extensive and detailed kind, amounting in all to cxxxvi pages. The editor has evidently made a long and very careful study of Catullus, and his views, which are in some cases new, uniformly imply considerable examination of the latest writers on the subject; for which reason, as well as for its excellent typography and fine appearance, (I speak here of the larger edition, the smaller omits the *Prolegomena*, and cannot stand comparison with Schwabe's edition of 1886,) the book deserves a large circulation wherever the world-famous poems of the Veronese are read.

I will begin with some of the principal changes in the *text* which Schmidt has introduced.

i. 9. After Fröhner,

Qualecumque tuo, patrone, uerbo,

which certainly removes the difficulty of *patrona uirgo*, but involves a rather harsh asyndeton: *habe . . . Qualecumque . . . maneat*.

vi. 7. *Ecquidnam tacitum? cubile clamat*.

xxi. 11. *A te mi puer et sitire discet*, after Munro.

xxii. 7. *membranae* is retained (as by Munro), but not disconnected from v. 8, in which I think most scholars will agree with the new editor.

xxviii. 6. After this v. Schmidt marks a lacuna of one verse, explaining *expensum* as part of a sentence to this effect, 'or have

you expended more than you received?' This idea is not new, and was virtually suggested by Clumper, *Misc. Phil. et Paed.* II. 147.

xxix. 9. Sillig's *haut idoneus* is retained. The editor says he could never persuade himself that Catullus wrote *aut Adoneus*. For my own part nothing will ever persuade me that Catullus *could* have written anything so tame, and so defective in significance, as *haut idoneus*. I suggest, if *Adoneus* is thought impossible, that *Adonius*, either as adjective agreeing with *columbus*, or as substantive, may be right. The form Ἀδώνιος was largely used by the comic writers, Aristophanes, Cratinus, Plato, Pherecrates.

xxix. 21. Munro's emendation,

Et huicne Gallia et metet Britannia?

is accepted as 'reliquis omnibus longe praeferenda,' but with *metit* for *metet*. On the other hand, in 23 the extraordinary word *putissimei* is adopted, quod uellem explicasset Schmidius. Possibly a modification of Munro's conjecture may seem to some more likely—

Eone nomine, urbis ob luem suae,
Socer generque, perdidistis omnia?

'was it for this, to humour the abomination of his native Formiae, that ye ruined all?' *urbis suae* = Formiarum, as Horace speaks of *In Mamurrarum lassi deinde urbe manemus*, *Sat.* i. 5, 37. There would thus be a fine irony in making the wealth of the world pander to this bankrupt upstart of Formiae (*Decoretis Formiani*, Catull. xli. 4).

xxxvii. 10. *ropionibus* (=mentulis) is accepted, as recently by Schwabe in his edition

of 1885. If Bücheler is right, however, the first *o* of *ropio* is short, *Rhein. Mus.* xxxv. 399. I confess (with Schöll) my doubts as to this new reading; certainly it cannot rank with *mulio consul*, Bücheler's discovery in Juv. viii.

xi. 5. *An ut peruenias in ora vulgi?* is bracketed as possibly spurious, for reasons which seem to me very unconvincing.

xlii. 13. *Non assis facit* Schmidt for *facis* of MSS. This seems very probable: but it cannot be called necessary.

lvii. 7. *lecticulo*, with Bährens: I cannot think rightly: *uix sincerum sonat*.

lxiii. 63. Wilamowitz' explanation of *Ego mulier* as ἐγὼ ἡ γυνή is adopted. If, however, this view is right, it seems strange that all the three following nominatives should equally prefix *ego*. Surely this uniform *ego* points to a uniform relation of *all* four to the subsequent verse.

lxiv. 196. *Quas ego me miseram* for *uae misera*.

273. *lenes* resonant.

287. *caris* for *doris*.

lxv. 9. *Alloquar, audiero*, etc., is rejected, and on a ground which is certainly of weight, the repetition of *loqui* (*loquentem*).

lxvii. 12. *Uerum istud populi uana loquella facit*.

lxviii. 33. Schmidt defends *percurrit*, (which Cluverius changed to *praecurrat*), on the plea that the streamlet *Gazza* which runs through Brixia joins the Mella, and might have been considered anciently a branch of it. This is ingenious, and perhaps true.

lxviii. is treated as one poem with two breaks, after 40 and 148, not as two distinct poems. This is practically my view: 'Prooemio et epologo tamquam inuolucris utrimque includitur,' p. cxxvi.

39. Schmidt retains (as I do) *posta est*. He also agrees with me in keeping *dominam* in 68, accepting my explanation in opposition to Munro's, which indeed Munro himself seems to have retracted in the *Journal of Philology*, viii. 333. I am a little hurt that my conjecture in the very disputed v. 118, *Qui actutum* for *Qui tum*, passes unnoticed. This curious adverb is constantly corrupted in MSS., *ac* separating from *tutum* and then falling out; and the sense thus obtained is excellently in keeping with the passage.

157. *Et qui, quam primo nobis terram dedit, aufert*. Schöll, and Vahlen, (in a

Berlin programme), have argued for the genuineness of *terram dedit aufert* against all former editions. Schmidt follows them, altering *Et qui principio* as above.

lxxiii. 4. I own my surprise to find that Bücheler's *Prodest* is still thought doubtful. Doubtless many other words are possible; but is any so likely? Schmidt prefers Munro's *Iam inuat*.

In the account which our new editor gives of the MSS. I have found nothing new. In the main he accepts Bährens' view that *G* and *O* are practically sufficient for the constitution of the text; yet acknowledges the falsity of the view which Bährens holds with equal tenacity, that all not *O* is either *G* or a copy of *G*. Of the Datanus, on which I have always laid great stress, his opinion is wavering; he does not seem to feel the force, first noticed by Fröhner, and always to me irresistible, of the *unique spellings* which this MS. presents. On the other hand, he follows me in drawing important inferences from the *Bononiensis*, written in 1411; and, speaking broadly, is not disposed to discard all the 15th century MSS. with Bährens, between whom and Schwabe's edition of 1885 he seems to hold on this point a middle place.

The most original part of Schmidt's volume is the discussion of the poet's life. Since Schwabe's *Quaestiones* nothing so full, to my knowledge, has been attempted. I hope to consider the whole of his views in the new edition of my Commentary now preparing, and cannot do anything like justice to them here. I may, perhaps, however, say that the fault of this highly interesting monograph (for such it really is) lies perhaps in an over-readiness to accept unsubstantial or insufficient proofs, and to build upon them as if they formed a perfectly solid foundation. The excellent and completely original treatise of the Scandinavian Edward à Bruner, to which I was the first to call attention in my edition of 1867, has at last received its due acknowledgment; and even the humblest contributions from his own country, some of them, I must needs say, of very little worth, come in for their meed of recognition in his *prolegomena*. Englishmen will be glad to see how greatly our editor has availed himself of the *Elucidations* of Munro, and (I may with all modesty add) my own edition.

ROBINSON ELLIS.

ORELLI'S HORACE.

Orelli's Horace. Fourth Edition. By W. HIRSCHFELDER. Vol. I. S. Calvary and Co. Berlin. 1885, 1886. 18 Mk.

A NEW edition of Orelli's great work has long been needed, the last edition having been published in 1850. As regards the Odes the present edition is strictly conservative in character, and the variations from the third edition are not numerous, except in the *apparatus criticus*, which is much improved, the editor specially expressing his obligations to Keller and Holder, and the knowledge of 'the better Horatian MSS.' to be derived from them.

Following the authority of the MSS., changes of spelling in the text are fairly numerous: *candentis umeros*, *inpicie*, *umor*, *adposuisse*, and the like are ordinary; but *nanctæ*, *bimenstri*, are less usual, while *coturno*, *Euhius*, *Euhoe*, *pelice*, *querqueta*, and *inuleo* (1, 23, 1), will perplex some old-fashioned admirers of the Odes.

Many of the alterations in the text are very interesting. In 1, 3, 7, *reddas incolumem precor* is probably rightly printed without a comma before *precor*, though *reddas* may undoubtedly be used absolutely like *sapias* 1, 11, 6, *vites* 1, 14, 20, and *parcas* 3, 10, 17, where, however, some suggest that on the analogy of *reddas precor* the true construction is *curcat parcas*.¹ *Te Sthenelus* 1, 15, 24, takes the place of *et Sthenelus*, but the metrical reasons for the change are not cogent, and the use of the plural verb *urgent* is strongly against it. In 1, 17, 9, for the meaningless *hæduleæ*, *hædiliæ* is read on the authority of Porphyrius, thus confirming Bentley's conjecture *hæduleæ*, and the form corresponding to *porcillæ*. Instead of *Tu bibes*, 1, 20, 10, the authority of Porphyrius again establishes the certainly correct reading *Tum bibes*: 'You shall first have some Sabine,' says Horace, 'specially bottled in your honour, and then I will give you some Cæcuban and Calenian: I must warn you, however, that if you want Falerian or Formian you will be disappointed'; just in the same way one might offer a distinguished friend some La Rose or Léoville

¹ This is, I believe, Dr. Kennedy's view, but was also suggested to me independently by Mr. H. R. Smith, of Malvern.

after dinner, and modestly apologize for the absence of Latour or Lafite of '58. *Iactibus* is an improvement on *Ictibus*, 1, 25, 2, stones being 'flung' at Lydia's 'closed windows,' and in the same Ode *Euro* is rightly accepted as an emendation of *Hebro*. Notwithstanding its strong authority we can only receive with regret *serva necessitas*, 1, 35, 17, instead of the 'grim necessity' we are accustomed to. In the absence of religious belief Chance and Necessity are two personifications of the mysterious power which seems to govern human life; of the two figures Necessity is the more imposing and imperious, and cannot naturally be described as the 'slave of Chance.' *Notior* for *ocior*, 2, 20, 13, has good authority, improves the sense, and does away with an unjustifiable hiatus, while for this latter reason *male inominatis*, 3, 14, 11, is approved of in the notes, though not admitted into the text. In 3, 3, 10, *nutricis* is given for *altricis*, and 3, 3, 38, *reddidit* for *addidit*. *Terrenum omne tuis et mare publicum*, 3, 24, 4, is supported by Porphyrius and must be accepted, because it is impossible to imagine any one building a villa 'on the Apulian coast.' In 3, 29, 6, *Æsula* becomes *Æfulæ*, a Roman colony between Tibur and Præneste, while 3, 29, 34, *medio alveo* has strong authority, and gives the proper sense 'adown its bed,' which cannot be obtained from *medio aquore*. *Teque, dum procedis*, 4, 2, 49, has in its favour *codices plerique*, in his *Blandinius antiquissimus*, and, if accepted, involves the reference of *te* to *Triumpe* although throughout the Ode *te* refers to Antonius. *Pulchrior evenit* for *exiet*, 4, 4, 65, will be universally approved, although the simple meaning of *evenit*, 'comes forth,' is rare.

As a rule the printing is accurate and good, but *murs* and *Longa* occur close together in the text; *usur* and *Densine perivæx* are found on one page; 3, 2, 2, two lines are printed twice, and 3, 6, 2, *de tenero meditatatur angui* seems to describe an Epicurean dream of dining on stewed serpents.

In the notes the editor has added some good collections of Horatian usages, e.g., 1, 1, 4, the use of *collegisse* as a strict logical perfect is illustrated by many similar instances; 1, 6, 3, the frequent division *qui—cunque*; 1, 15, 2, the fondness for Greek forms such as *Helene* in the Odes. There is

an excellent note, 4, 1, 1, on the versification of the Fourth Book, and on the novel words used in it, *faustitas*, *beluosus*, *tauriformis*, *domabilis*, *inimicare*, *adprecari*, *obarmare*, *remiscere*, *aternare*.

The notes contain some important deviations from Orelli's views, among which the following deserve mention. *Male pertinaci*, 1, 9, 24, *male* is rightly explained as *increasing* the force of *pertinaci*, as in *male raucus*. *Quis sub Arcto* . . . 1, 26, 3, *quis* is taken as a nominative, and it is pointed out that the reference is to the King of the Dacians, whose raids at this time caused alarm, cf. 3, 8, 18. In the Archytas Ode the dialogue theory is repudiated, and may indeed now be fairly relegated to the limbo of departed superstitions. On *ciboria*, 2, 7, 22, just praise is awarded to a conjecture of F. Bücheler, that Septimius had after Philippi joined Antony in Egypt and remained there, and that this Egyptian word for a 'goblet' is used designedly. The nominative of *Sabinis*, 2, 18, 14, is rightly given as *Sabini*, for *Sabina* cannot be put for *Sabina prædia*, especially in the ablative. *Altior Italiae ruinis*, 3, 5, 40, is 'raised higher by the downfall of Italy,' and not 'towering higher than fallen Italy.' It is allowed that 3, 11, 16-20 is an interpolation. The objections to *Iule*, 4, 2, 2, are forcibly stated and seem unanswerable, but few will be found to agree with the emendation approved of in the note *Icari factis*, and, were it not for the hiatus in *emulari ille*, Peerlkamp's suggestion is infinitely better, the use of *ille*, which Orelli calls 'most frigid,' being exactly parallel to its use (*quem . . . illum*) in line 3 of the next Ode. *Per laborem*, 4, 2, 29, is taken as 'laboriously,' and *plurimum circa nemus* are connected, as sense and sound alike demand, but *plurimum* is explained as *spissum*, though why the natural rendering 'full many a grove' is objectionable it is hard to say. In an excursus on 4, 8, 13, objection is taken to the explanation of *damna celestia*, as referring to the waning of the moon in heaven, for it is observed that the whole Ode dwells on the lesson which *earth* inculcates with its changing seasons, and *damna celestia* is explained as *damna celo* (i.e. by its changes, variations, &c.) *terre adlata*: as the year advances the celestial influences gradually take away growth and vigour, bringing decay and death; but when the new year comes, 'the swift months soon make good this heaven-sent loss.'

The points referred to show sufficiently the great merits of this edition. It is, however,

in several instances capable of improvement. Orelli's old note on the very difficult phrase *fabuleque manes*, 1, 4, 16, is left unaltered: the first part of this note (*fabule, non est gen. sing. sed nom. plur., Manes fabulosi, id est, inanes*) is very misleading, and the whole note generally perplexing; it should be clearly pointed out what sense the imitation of Persius shows must attach to *fabule*, viz. 'names,' 'subjects of talk,' 'mere material for gossip,' cf. Juv. 1, 145, *fabula . . . funus*, and for the very rare opposition Lucan, 1, 313, *et nomina vana Catones*. On 1, 7, 20, *seu te . . . castra tenent, seu densa tenebit* the note on *tenent* '*rursus aliquando ut antea sæpe*' is simply wrong; *tenent* is not a future, as the note makes it, but is most forcibly contrasted with the future *tenebit*, the variation in tense being employed to suggest to Plancus how glad Horace would be if he would quit the camp for Tibur. The old explanation of *notus animi*, 2, 2, 6, as *notus propter animum* is retained, and also 4, 13, 21, *nota artium*, although the construction is unexampled, and the genitive may in the first case reasonably and in the second case certainly be explained as a simple genitive of quality. Those who have read the essay of H. T. Plüss will not be satisfied that 'all doubts are refuted' by Bücheler's explanation of *quem vocas, Dilecte Mæcenas*, 2, 20, 6, '*quem vocas ut ego audiam, clusam, quoniam cliens turus sum*'. In 3, 33, 3, *redonabo* is not = *condonabo*; Nauck rightly says, 'I will give up to Mars who has a claim on him,' the use of *re* being regular. The eighth Ode of the Fourth Book is accepted as it stands, and the weighty objection that it alone of the Odes is not divisible into stanzas is passed over, Orelli's careful remarks on Meineke's canon being omitted.

The editor follows Orelli in treating all English editions since the days of Bentley and Cunningham as if they were non-existent. Probably this is due to the fact that English editors have paid comparatively little attention to spelling, to the scholia, to MSS., and to emendations. An opinion apparently prevails in Germany, and is becoming increasingly prevalent in England, that these things constitute the most important portion of the study of classical literature. It may be so. It may be that the Odes of Horace—the Odes which amid the intellectual Sahara of Shrewsbury training were a green oasis to the weary soul of Charles Darwin—can only be properly understood by one who is strictly orthodox on the spelling of *querella*, who has groped for treasure among the antiquarian dustheaps of Por-

phyron, Acron and COMM. CRUQ., who can exactly estimate the evidential value of almost any, and who is aware that Dr. Bentley thinks that *capacis Orci* would, possibly on theological ground, be an improvement on *rapacis Orci*, while Peerlkamp, if he had written the Odes, would have written *Sudare magnos jam video duces*. It may be so; but, if it is so, then the study of the classics, long and justly considered a necessary part of liberal education, will not long withstand the vigorous attacks with which it is continually assailed. The great classical writers have served for the delight

and discipline of many generations, because it has been their singular good fortune to express imperishable thoughts in language the perfection of which has never been surpassed, and rarely rivalled. They will cease to be studied if, instead of endeavouring to understand the secret of their living force, we make it our chief object to attain to a laborious knowledge of dry and unprofitable details connected with their survival. We shall find that we have let slip the kernel, while engaged in learned disquisitions about the exact constitution of the husk.

T. E. PAGE.

JEBB'S OEDIPUS TYRANNUS.

Sophocles. Oedipus Tyrannus. Professor
JEBB. 2nd Edition. 12s. 6d.

PROFESSOR JEBB has subjected his commentary on the *Oed. Tyr.*, which appeared in 1883, to a careful and laborious revision throughout. He most truly says, 'The commentary, as it is now sent forth, will furnish sufficient evidence of the desire which I have felt to profit by any criticism which has convinced my own judgment, and to express gratitude for such criticism in the most practical form.' Nothing need be said here of the consummate excellence of the book, as it was, and is: the object of the present notice is to call attention to some of the alterations in detail which have been made in the new edition, rendering the book more than ever a 'vivid exposition' of Prof. Jebb's mind in relation to Sophocles.

The critical notes on the text have been rewritten in English. Latin critical notes were a survival and a luxury, hardly consistent with an English commentary; and common sense approves the change. But it entails some sacrifices. The 'traditional Latin of scholars' had its merits. Prof. Jebb was not one to avail himself of its controversial amenities. He never described a rejected emendation by the favourite 'traditional' epithet *putidissima*, so sweetly suggestive to the modern reader. But we miss in the sober English of the new critical notes such felicities as 'vulneris antiqui cicatrix,' 'praeposteram lectionem ἐξέθηκε κατέφρονε,' 'huius versus causam orare nullo coram iudice reformidem,' 'quod vereor ut Sophocleae Χάρες facile patiantur.' Professor Jebb is more impressed than formerly

with the truth of the view that 'the positive worth of the corrections supplied by the other MSS. is no greater than it easily might have been if the Laurentian were their common parent.' He therefore adopts (when 'more specific statement is unnecessary') a summary and general denotation of the later MSS., by which 'the paramount significance of the Laurentian is brought into clear and bold relief.'

Notes either entirely rewritten or materially altered will be found at lines 34, 43, 98, 161, 178, 325, 397, 523, 775, 997, 1293, 1415. At 171 is a new note; at 1002, 1520, new notes, with change in translation; at 71, a defence of ἡναιάμην added; at 493, note rewritten, but view maintained; at 1090, suggested emendation withdrawn, with new note, and further discussion in Appendix; a corresponding change at 1101; at 1219, defence at greater length of Prof. Jebb's ingenious correction ὥσπερ ἰάλεμον χέων. At 478, J. F. Martin is credited with anticipation of Prof. Lushington's conjecture, πέρπας ἰσόταπος.

I am encouraged by Prof. Jebb's more than courteous reception of past criticisms to venture a few remarks suggested by some of the additions or alterations in this edition. 44. In note, the rendering 'issues of counsels' is now explained as concise for 'occurrences connected with (resulting from) counsels.' But τύχην ἐσθλὴν τῇδε τῆς ὁδοῦ, O.C. 1506, is 'the good fortune of this coming' (Prof. Jebb's translation), gen. of definition. In Thuc. i. 140, τὰς ἐνυφορὰς τῶν πραγμάτων, the gen. is, I think, objective ('the way in which things are brought together,' 'the comings-about of things'), cp.

Thuc. i. 23, παθήματα ξυνήνεχθη γενέσθαι. Prof. Jebb says, 'Objectors fail to distinguish between English and Greek gen. They think that because we could not say "occurrences of counsels," therefore συμφοραὶ βουλευμάτων in this sense is impossible. It would be just as reasonable to object to λυγρῶν πόνων ἰκτῆρες (185) because we could not say "suppliants of weary woes." But πόνων ἰκτῆρες (if indeed the gen. does not go with the verb of emotion ἐπιστενάχονσι) is like ἐνθάκῃσι ἡλίον or ἀπόβασις γῆς or ἐρώτησις πηλοῦ. It is (indirectly) objective; corresponding to ἰκετεύειν περὶ πόνων as they to ἐνθακεῖν (ἐν) ἡλίῳ, ἀποβῆναι ἐς γῆν, ἐρωτᾶν περὶ πηλοῦ. Prof. Jebb, insisting on the strangeness of συμφοραὶ βουλευμάτων in the sense 'collationes consiliorum,' seems hardly to give due weight to the consideration that Sophocles had presumably in his mind the Aeschylean συμφέρειν βουλευήματα. 'If Sophocles had intended to suggest συμφέρειν βουλευήματα,' Prof. Jebb says, βουλευήματων would have come at once. But ζώσας comes at once, to warn the hearer that there is something unusual about ξυμφοράς. And in giving up 'issues,' as he practically does, Prof. Jebb loosens his hold upon ζώσας. 'Conferences of counsels' (i.e. 'counsels when men confer') may be said to 'live,' and so may 'issues of counsels,' but hardly 'occurrences.' Again, 'the new interpretation' does not say, 'Men of experience are most ready to consult other people'; but 'Men of experience may prove their superior wisdom, not only unaided, but also in conference with others.' This does not lower Oedipus 'to the ordinary level,' but saves εἴτ' ἂν 'ἀνδρὸς ὁσθί πον from the appearance of doing so. Most readers will agree that Prof. Kennedy's 'collatio exemplorum' in support of his 'law of ὥς, since,' does not 'live' (or 'breathes but badly') after Prof. Jebb's examination; and the same may be said of the collection of passages, by means of which Dr. Verrall, as Prof. Jebb humorously says, has gone near to prove that ξυμφορὰ never means 'occurrence.' 155. No longer explained 'Are we to suffer a new plague or an old one?' but 'Must the mode of expiation be new or old?' Qu. however if the normal meaning of ξένῳ ('what thing thou wilt work for me') suffices for this? In *Ant.* 1178 the normal meaning of ἀνίω is hardly suitable to the prophet, and in *O.C.* 454 it makes ποτὶ = 'at length.' 220. (1) Prof. Jebb now says (following in this Prof. Butcher), 'The suppressed protasis is εἰ μὴ ἐξείπον, supplied from ἐξερῶ. "For, if I had not thus spoken,—appealing

to you for help in tracking the crime,—I should not have tracked it far by myself." But is it possible to say 'I will appeal: for, if I had not appealed, I should have failed. But now I do appeal.'? Prof. Butcher says, 'Oedipus has thrown himself in imagination into the future, and looks back upon the event.' Could a man say, 'I will jump; for, if I had not jumped, I should have been a coward. But now—I jump'? Surely, if the sentence οὐ γὰρ κ.τ.λ. referred to the appeal which Oedipus is about to make, we should have ἰχνεύοιμι. (2) Prof. Jebb avoids the 'logical contradiction' of his former version ('if I had not had some clue; but, as it is, having no clue.') But he does not, like Prof. Butcher, avail himself of the suppressed protasis εἰ μὴ ἐξείπον ['if I had not appealed to you, I should have failed. But now I do appeal to you, I should have failed. But now I do appeal to you.'] He regards μὴ οὐκ ἔχων τι σύμβολον as a second protasis limiting the first: 'If I had not appealed to you, I should have failed—unless indeed I had possessed a clue. But (νῦν δὲ) I possess none, and therefore I appeal to you.' Now there are two points here. (A) μὴ οὐκ ἔχων is made to stand for μὴ ἔχων, the οὐ being explained as due to the negative main verb. (B) μὴ ἔχων is made to mean 'unless I had possessed (*which I did not*). To begin with (B). μὴ ἔχων cannot be explained, I submit, as the equivalent of ὅτε μὴ εἶχον, 'in a case where I had no clue.' A generic clause, ὅτε μὴ εἶχον, with causal force, would indeed make admirable sense; but (1) it could not be followed by νῦν δέ, which requires a preceding unfulfilled supposition; (2) its participial equivalent would be οὐκ ἔχων. μὴ ἔχων, without article, and *adverbial*, must be hypothetical, standing therefore for εἰ μὴ εἶχον, 'if I had not possessed (*which I did*). The Greek for 'I should have failed, unless I had possessed a clue,' so as to avoid the inference '*which I did*,' is surely οὐκ ἂν μακρὰν ἔχενον, εἰ μὴ σύμβολον ἔχων; or (if the inference '*which I did not*' be intended) εἰ μὴ εἰ εἶχον. (A) The translation 'Unless I had some clue, I could not have tracked it far' implies that a Greek writer would or could have written (as Prof. Jebb says he could) οὐκ ἂν ἀπέθανε μὴ οὐ μαχόμενος, meaning 'He would not have been slain, unless he had fought.' I venture to think that the nine recorded examples of μὴ οὐ with participle (if Dem. *F.L.* p. 379 may be spoken of as one) afford no support to this view; and that, if this sentence occurred, it would mean 'He would not have been slain, *unless he had refused to fight*,' on the principle of εἰ μὴ Πρόξενον οὐχ ὑπέδεξαντο, Dem. *F.L.* p. 364.

314. ἀφ' ὧν ἔχοι. The optative and subjunctive are equally used in 'universal statements': the difference seems to be, that the optative (in a primary sentence) generalises hypothetically, suggesting a doubt; much as 'It is a man's noblest task to help others, however he *might*,' differs from 'however he *may*.' Cp. *Apol.* 19E, ἐπεὶ καὶ τοῦτό γέ μοι δοκεῖ καλὸν εἶναι, εἰ τις οἷός τ' εἴη παιδεύειν ἀνθρώπους. 316. ἐνθα μὴ λύει, 'in all cases where': ἐνθα μὴ λύει, 'in a case where.' The former in Latin being *indic.* (with *ubi-cumque* or the like); the latter, *subjunct.* (without the *cumque*). 380. Prof. Jebb now takes *τέχνη* to be 'the art of ruling.' He still understands τῷ πολυζήλῳ βίῳ, not as 'the much-envied life (of princes),' but as 'the life (of men) with its many rivalries': but the 'locative' dative in this interpretation seems questionable. 420. Prof. Jebb retains the dislocation of ποῖος λυμήν, ποῖος Κίθαιρών ('what place will not be harbour, what of all Cithaeron will not ring?'), and the (to me) impossible 'ποῖος Κίθαιρών = ποῖον μέρος Κίθαιρώνος'; but, in accordance with Prof. Butcher's correction, he now translates τὸν ἡμέναιον ὃν εἰσέπλευσας 'the marriage into which thou didst sail.' Surely the rest follows. 'From the storms of that harbourless harbour, even Cithaeron will be a haven.' 'What haven, what Cithaeron (what haven, though it should be Cithaeron itself) will not ring with thine outcries?' (Cp. *ἔα με ναίειν ὅρεσιν* κ.τ.λ. 1451). Can it be said that this 'weakens the figurative force of λυμήν'? 690. Prof. Jebb omits 'The εἰ νοσφίζομαι of the MSS. would necessarily imply that the Chorus do reject Oedipus.'

He still, however, argues against νοσφίζομαι. But there is nothing 'playful or ironical' about the *indic.* in *Apol.* 25B. ('If it is as you say, the young men have good reason to congratulate themselves,' 'might indeed be thought fortunate.') 1455. The note has been rewritten. But 'οἶδα οὐκ ἂν πέρσαι would be more usual' is not consistent with 'The ordinary usage is...μὴ with infin. after verbs of feeling confident...as πέποιθα, etc.' The possible constructions (in order of usualness) are: (1) οἶδα as verb of sense (*a*) with οὐ and partic., (*b*) with μὴ and partic. [of which *Oed. C.* 656 has always seemed to me a most difficult example; so much so, that I think Schaefer is right in his conj. οἶδ' ἐγὼ σ' οὐ μὴ τινα...ἀπάξοντ': indirect for οὐ μὴ ἀπάξει, like οὐ μὴ πέρσοιεν, *Phil.* 611, οὐ μὴ πράξεν, *Phoen.* 1590]. (2) οἶδα = πέποιθα, followed, like πέποιθα, by infin. with μὴ. On the question whether πέρσαι ἂν = πέρσοιεν ἂν or ἐπερσεν ἂν, Prof. Jebb, who holds for the future sense, remarks, 'The poet of *Colonus* gives Oedipus a presentiment that his end is not to be as that of other men.' But is κακῶ quite consistent with this? If πέρσαι ἂν is prospective, Oedipus is looking forward to a climax of evil. But surely *that* climax is past. 1529. Is δαβύζειν consecutive (no full stop at ἐλήλυθεν), or imperative? Prof. Jebb says imper.; and (in second edition) justifies the subject in the *accus.* by saying that the infin. represents an imper. of the third person (quoting for this *Il.* 5, 284). But *can* it stand for an imper. of the third person, no subject being expressed, otherwise than by θνητὸν ὄντα, ἐπισκοποῦντα?

R. WHITELAW.

LEONTIUS OF BYZANTIUM.

Leontius von Byzanz und die gleichnamigen Schriftsteller der Griechischen Kirche (pp. 317). Von Dr. Loofs. Leipzig: Hinrichs. 1887. 10 Mk.

THE present volume, forming Band iii. Heft 1, 2 of Gebhardt and Harnack's *Texte und Untersuchungen*, is the first volume of a series of investigations into the writings which are grouped in the Greek and Latin Patrologies under the name of Leontius. It is devoted to the personal history of Leontius of Byzantium, and to a critical study of his theological writings; the second volume, which may be

expected in about twelve months from the issue of the first, being reserved for a study of Leontius of Neapolis, Leontius presbyter and monk, and author of the life of S. Gregory, and the extremely valuable collections of early Patristic extracts which pass under the name of *Parallels*, and are usually attributed to John of Damascus. The latter part of this volume will find its place among the Leontian writings owing to the fact that some copies of *Parallels* bear the ascription of joint-authorship of Leontius and John—a fact which at once suggests, what a cursory examination of those copies of the *Parallels* which are extant confirms, that there is an

earlier nucleus around which the Parallel-literature has gathered. And when it is noticed that in the course of the volume before us Dr. Loofs shows that John of Damascus in his other theological writings betrays an acquaintance with Leontius of Byzantium, and that both of these writers were at some period of their lives in the cloister of S. Saba, we may look forward with some expectancy to the solution of a very perplexing problem in the early Patristic literature, nor shall we be surprised if Dr. Loofs succeeds in extracting an original Parallel-book of Leontius out of the later collection. Only we will venture to prophesy, judging from experience of time spent on this very problem, that the second volume of Loofs' Leontius will not be published very early in 1888.

Meanwhile we have the first volume, which is in every way an admirable piece of research in a very imperfectly known region of the Patristic literature. The personality of Leontius is historically obscure: the MSS. of his works describe him in terms which geographically vary, and officially seem to contradict one another. Sometimes he is Leontius of Byzantium, sometimes of Jerusalem; occasionally he is described as priest, but sometimes as hermit or monk. The same confusion which is found in MS. descriptions prevails through the scanty historical notices which we find brought together by earlier writers as well as by Loofs. Leontius is a common name enough. Over a score of references to persons of that name are to be found in the period which the investigation covers, viz. the half-century preceding the second Council of Constantinople (553). Hence the greatest care is necessary in avoiding hasty identifications. It is the merit of Loofs' work that it shows first, from a study of the theological writings ascribed to Leontius, that they are almost all due to a single powerful mind, and that their writer must have been the prince of theology of his time; second, that the historical notices which can be collected allow us to identify such a theologian under various descriptions, and to ascribe to him political influence only comparable with that of Athanasius the Great.

Of these identifications the first is as follows: on pp. 228-261 Loofs shows that Leontius belonged to the party of Scythian monks under the patronage of John Maxentius and Vitalian, of whom four went on an embassy from Constantinople to Rome in 519, in the interests of the Theopascite controversy and the maintenance of com-

munion between the Eastern and Western Churches. These Scythian monks addressed a letter when in Rome to Fulgentius of Ruspe, and Loofs analyses this letter and the writings of John Maxentius, in order to shew the similarity of their dogmatic standpoint with that of Leontius; only a few of these monks are known by name (though they must have occupied an important place amongst the defenders of the Chalcedonian orthodoxy); amongst them however is one Leontius. It is further shown that the Scythian monks as well as Leontius of Byzantium betray an acquaintance with the seldom-read books of dispute between Paul of Samosata and the presbyter Malchion, which looks as if Leontius were the brain of the party. Politically he was also in a leading situation, for there is evidence to show that he was a relative of Vitalian. These details are extremely important: they show, on the one hand, that if peace between East and West had been restored Leontius would have been its author, and on the other hand his works read side by side with the history of Monophysitism show him actually to have attained such a position in the final victory of the Chalcedonian orthodoxy in the East.

From the year 520 to 531 we find no trace of Leontius, but in this year, according to Loofs, occurred the celebrated "collatio cum Severianis," over which Hypatius of Ephesus presided: here a Leontius was present, who is described as "apocrisiarius patrum in sancta civitate constitutorum." Loofs holds this to be Leontius of Byzantium who now appears as apocrisiarius of a body of Jerusalem monks, and he supports his opinion by showing that the discussion moves on Leontian lines. But he does not throw any light on the use of the title apocrisiarius for Leontius. The title is usually given to the representative of one of the great Patriarchs or Bishops: (thus Pelagius I. was before his elevation to the Papacy apocrisiarius to Vigilius, and the deacon Primasius held the same position with regard to Bishop Reparatus of Carthage;) but there are cases in which it seems to denote a transient office, and to be nearly equivalent to our "representative." A reference to Sophocles' lexicon will I think show that the word is sometimes used of the representative of a monastery: and it is perfectly natural that if Leontius had joined a community of monks at Jerusalem or S. Saba, he should have been chosen to represent them in a dispute with the Severians. The same Leontius turns up again at the Synod of Mennas in

536. But here we have to face the great difficulty of Loofs' identification. If we believe Leontius of Byzantium and the Leontius of the "collatio cum Severianis" to be the same, we can hardly deny that the identification goes further and takes in the leader of the Origenist movement among the monks of S. Saba. In fact it is known from the life of Saba, one of the most accurate of monastic histories, that S. Saba went to Constantinople on an embassy for the alleviation of taxation in Palestine, taking with him a Byzantine Leontius, and while there held a dispute with the Monophysites (which Loofs thinks may be the very "collatio cum Severianis"). Leontius was left behind in Byzantium and did not return till S. Saba had died, when he began to make so much trouble with his Origenist views that the whole of the East was thrown into a state of ferment.

Now at first sight it seems unlikely that Leontius Fidei Defensor and Leontius Origenistes can be the same; but Loofs makes out a capital case for the identification, especially in incidental points, such as that when Ephraim of Antioch condemned the Origenist views, Leontius the Origenist went to Constantinople to obtain the support of the court

for the party to which he belonged; which is thoroughly likely if he had been in earlier life a resident, and in later life a visitor, in the city. And he uses his conclusion to explain the apparent neglect of Leontius by later writers (for even John of Damascus, who is known to have been acquainted with his writings and to have made use of them, does not give his name), and the fact that several of his most important works were re-written not long after his death by orthodox theologians. If this should turn out to be true, one can only regard it as a horrible punishment for a very innocent heresy, but not altogether undeserved, if, as Loofs suggests, he held his views for a long time under the disguise of the doctrine of accommodation.

It would not be easy to find a more important book than the present for the student of Monophysite views and movements: the most subtle of all heresies, as Newman calls it, is apt to be the most uninteresting; but Dr. Loofs does much to show the real lines that divided parties in the Church at a very critical period; and what he sees himself, his singularly straightforward and transparent style enables any one else to see with him.

J. RENDEL HARRIS.

Aeschylus, *Prometheus Vinculus*, with notes by M. G. GLAZEBROOK, M.A. Rivingtons. 2s. 6d.

THIS is an edition which has many strong points to recommend it to the schoolmaster. In the first place there is a lively introduction which will help boys to a clearer idea of the meaning and of the grandeur and beauty of the *Prometheus Vinculus* than they could easily get elsewhere. In this part the teacher too will doubtless find some enlightenment, though he may not think that the editor solves all difficulties in the great problem of the real standpoint of the characters. For instance Prometheus raises men to a civilized state; Zeus wanted to destroy them. A man at all events could hardly agree that Zeus is 'triumphantly' justified (Intro. p. xiv.). The grammatical notes, both in the introduction and in the commentary are sound, lucid, and concise; and the ideal of translation set before the learner is a high one. Judicious hints are given, where the constructions are such that any schoolboy who is not a genius would be likely to go wrong. Good examples of this kind of aid may be found in the notes on vv. 27, 81, 249, 319, 481, 523, 561, 600 (both notes), 693 (1), 722 (2), 763, 767 (2), 797, 934, 929 (3), 993, and 1009. The 'stage directions' and headings to the scenes in the text and commentary are useful, though it may be doubted whether more is not lost than is gained by partly abandoning the Greek division of the tragedy and lumping the *stasima* with the 'acts.' The notes on the choric metres are helpful and sound as far as they go, which is perhaps far enough. The last syllable but two in vv. 133 and 153 is marked

long instead of short in the first scheme on p. xxxiii. There are one or two points on which it may be worth while to express a difference of opinion. Surely Wecklein and Mr. Glazebrook are wrong at v. 220 (in this edition)—τὰ λῆστα βουλευόντων πειθεῖν . . . οὐκ ἔδου-κῆθην—in making πειθεῖν govern τὰ λῆστα and depend on βουλευόντων—'Though my purpose was to persuade.' Where can be found in tragedy, or in Attic Greek an instance of βουλευέω (in the sense of 'plan,' 'resolve') with an infinitive depending on it? The translation of 501f. κἄκρινα πρῶτος κ.τ.λ.—'And I was the first to judge from dreams what must really come to pass'—is original but, like the doctrine that σὺ is an enclitic, which is propounded in a note to v. 42, is it not itself not ὕπαρ but ὕπαρ? Mr. Glazebrook's reason for abandoning the usual translation is that 'if δ meant which dreams it would have been δσα not δ.' The word 'optative' in the note on v. 161, is a slip. Ἐδόθη on v. 340 should be εἶθουα. It is hardly right to call εἶνεκα exclusively Epic (v. 361, cf. Wecklein, *Curae Epigraphicae* p. 37). It is a question whether the L. and S. explanation of πῆγαι ἡλίου at 835 is not preferable to that given by Wecklein and the editor. Derivations are fitfully introduced. Is it not better to leave these to the dictionaries? Also it is difficult to see the use of the tiny *apparatus criticus* (consisting of the more important variants given in the text from that of the Codex Medicus) which follows the preface; since little is said of the history and nothing of the reasons for the several emendations, it is difficult to see what good the list can do to either younger or older students.—E. B. ENGLAND.

Herodotus. *The Ionic Revolt*, by E. D. STONE, M.A. Drake. Eton. 2s.

MR. STONE has selected a good and interesting passage from Herodotus in the Ionic Revolt, with the stories of Aristagoras and Histiaios, characteristically told. The introduction is short and clear; and, what is by no means an unimportant point for the beginners for whom such a selection is made, the *scale* of the notes is wisely limited to a few brief comments. Probably Mr. Stone is also right in not attempting (in so short a passage) to give any account of the Ionic forms. The boy who reads this book will have to learn them, no doubt: but he can get them from grammars, and any satisfactory survey of them would overweight the book. The allusions are generally explained with adequate fullness; and though some of the references and quotations might be omitted without loss, (as for instance the reference to *Oedipus Rex* on chap. 107, and the rather irrelevant quotation from Aristophanes on vi. chap. i.) there are not many of them altogether, and they are mostly to the point.

The notes on grammar perhaps leave something to be desired. Thus (p. 33, chap. 33) it is misleading to compare the *que* of *itaque* with the *τε* of *ἐπεὶ τε πρόσχημα* (p. 37, ch. 28) in the sense of 'glory' does surely not come from *πρόσχειν* 'to be superior' but from *πρόχεισθαι* 'to hold out before one's self.' Mr. Stone tells us that *ὡς ἂν* or *ὥς ἂν* with the optative is only found in Homer or Herodotus. It is also found in Aeschylus (*Ag.* 365): but this is a trifling inaccuracy: it is a much more important point that for the beginner it should be clearly stated *what* is the peculiarity of the usage. It is not instructive or accurate to say that '*καί* expresses something unexpected or unlikely' (p. 41, ch. 98), nor that '*καί* limits' (p. 42, ch. 101). *ἀρχήν* we are told is = *omnino*, but we are not told that this is only true in *negative* sentences. The note on the difficult question of *μή οὐ* with a participle (p. 47, ch. 9) it is perhaps dangerous to criticise, as opinions differ so much: but it is certainly misleading to say that '*μή οὐ* ought to imply a supposition, the *οὐ* being inserted as usual when a negative sentence precedes.' A boy would infer from this that if he had to translate 'you cannot run if you have no feet' he ought to put *οὐ δύνησιν τρέχειν μή οὐ πόδας ἔχωσι*: which is not true, and which Mr. Stone probably does not mean. Lastly it surely is wrong to translate *ἄρα μή σεωνδὸν ἐν αἰτρί σῆψις* 'beware lest you find yourself blamed,' Mr. Stone has misgivings, for he adds 'but *ἐν αἰτρί* *ἔχειν* usually means to blame.' Why not then translate it simply 'beware lest hereafter you have to blame yourself!'

Mr Stone's little edition would be improved by revision of a few points like the above: and at the same time he might correct some accents in the notes, such as *χρύσου, δέον, τῇ Ἀσίῃ, ἑλασσονι, πλῆρη*, and the singularly worded statement (p. 41) that 'Poseidon tells Heracles he is heir to *Jupiter*.'

A. S.

Herodotus. Buch VIII. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt von DR. J. SITZLER, Professor am Gymnasium in Tauberbischofsheim. Gotha. Friedrich Andreas Perthes. 1887. (8vo. Pp. iv. 108. 1 Mk. 30 Pf.)

A CONTINUATION of the editor's work on Book VII., in the Preface of which the principles on which the edition is based have been described. The edition is designed for use in school. As the notes are in German, few English schoolboys, or even undergraduates, are in a position to use the book. An estimate of it may, however, be of service to those engaged in teaching in our schools and universities.

In the *Preface* the schoolmaster is advised to omit in class four passages in the book: cc. 43-48, the list of ships; 72, 73, the population of the Peloponnese; 104-106, the story of Hermotimos; 137-139, the fortunes (*Schicksale*) of Amyntas (*sic*). Chapter 139 contains the pedigree of Alexander, and might be omitted, if it were worth while to omit four lines. Chapters 137, 138 contain a thoroughly good story about Perdikkas, which it would be a great pity to omit. The *Introduction* contains four divisions: I. Herodotus' Life; II. Herodotus' Journeys; III. Herodotus' Work; IV. A short sketch of the Dialect of Herodotus. This last division is of some practical use, and frequent and convenient reference is made to it in the notes.

The text is unusually well printed for a German edition. You will not be irritated on every page by defects of the type or printer's work. How the text is arrived at is not stated. Some emendations are admitted which are not usually printed in the texts, as *ἰώνων* in c. 91, or even noticed in the previous editors, as the words *τῶν κ.τ.λ.* in 82. These insertions are always properly indicated. Every chapter is printed separately, and not, as is usual, in paragraphs according to the continuity of the passage: the lines of each chapter are numbered. This arrangement is evidently based on the principle that shows itself in the notes, which are copious of their kind. The notes appear to be written on the principle of leaving no linguistic or grammatical point of any difficulty unnoticed or unexplained. No other editor has approached Dr. Sitzler in the number of minute directions in this department. Dialectical variations, peculiarities of tense, mood, case, or construction are duly indicated: words or phrases are translated, or the student's attention called to their difficulty. Space is gained for this microscopic critique by the sacrifice of almost everything bearing upon the comprehension of the narrative, except the words or phrases in which it is clothed. Points in the geography form almost the only noticeable exception. This is a perfectly legitimate and serviceable object or principle for an editor to take as his guide: the only question is how in the present case it has been carried out. On the whole it must be said with considerable success: one might even wish that the principle had been so rigorously applied as to have left nothing of any difficulty without explanation. It is not, however, always possible to explain words fully without taking into account the material meaning and general points of view: this the editor recognises, but not always happily. Thus chapter 22, 5, for 'Hellas' I would suggest 'Athen,' and in line 12 for 'die Griechen,' 'die Athenen' (und Eretrier). Nor can I always accept Dr. Sitzler's exegesis, even on his own special ground. Thus c. 11, 3, *ἐργου πολέμου* ought rather to be *μάχης*. In 25, 1, to the genitive *ἐπαγγελαμένου* he supplies *τοῦ κήρυκος*, missing the force of the middle. (Cp. bk. vii. c. 1.) Nor in 2, 6 need *στρατηγὸς* be supplied to *δ' Ἀλέων*, any more than *Βασιλέα* to *τὸν Πέρσην* in 3, 9. These supplements and hypothetical *subaudita* kill the idiom of the language. Surely *ἀπίστους* in 22, 16, is entitled on Dr. Sitzler's principle to a note. As is perhaps well in a school book, the notes are expressed in rather dogmatic form. There are few references to any illustrations, or analogies: such references as are given are mostly to other chapters in the book. There is no index. I can hardly imagine English teachers, with a passion now happily growing for the 'Realien,' relying on such an edition as this alone: but any student or teacher will find it very serviceable if used in addition to other well-known editions.

R. W. M.

Athenaei Naucraticae Dipsosophistarum.
Libri xv. Recensuit G. KAIBEL. Vol. II. Libri
vi-x. Teubner. 1887. 4 Mk. 80.

ALTHOUGH Kaibel proposes expressly to edit Athenaeus, and not the fragments quoted by Athenaeus for their own sake, his edition is indispensable to all students of the comic fragments, as he has collated anew the Marcian MS. (A). His critical notes contain many good suggestions, not only of his own but of Wilamowitz. For example on p. 56 (= 249b) for *σιλοδούνους* of A. he proposes *σολιδούρους*, comparing *solduri* in Caesar B. G. iii, 20. Again in a corrupt quotation from Hipparchos' Egyptian Iliad

οὐδέ μοι Αἰγυπτίων βίος ἥρπεν ὅαν ἔχουσι
χέννια τίλλοντες καλκατιαδεσσαλέοντα

Kaibel very cleverly and probably suggests that in the last word *κάλκιστος* (a sort of Egyptian bread, mentioned by Herodotus and Hecataeus) may be latent. I cannot however go with him when he supposes that *εσσαλέοντες* ended the line. It would be much better to read

χέννια τίλλοντες καὶ κυλλήστεις ἀλέοντες.

On p. 409 (= 418b) it seems to me that a corruption of the text is unnecessarily assumed. The passage is: Πολύβιος δ' ὁ Μεγαλοπολίτης ἐν τῇ εἰκοστῇ τῶν ἱστοριῶν φησὶν ὡς Βωιωτοὶ μεγίστην δόξαν λαβόντες κατὰ τὰ λευκτρικά κατὰ μικρὸν ἀνέπεσον ταῖς ψυχαῖς καὶ ὀρμησάμενοι ἐπ' εὐωχίας καὶ μέθας διέθεντο καὶ κοινωνεῖα τοῖς φίλοις. The meaning seems clear enough: ἀνέπεσον ταῖς ψυχαῖς = *animis* (or *studii*) *refrigerunt*, that is, they degenerated, and διέθεντο κοινωνεῖα = 'they got up clubs.'

In a passage from the *Πρόγονοι* of Antiphanes, Kaibel as well as other editors has missed what appears to me a very obvious emendation (p. 34 = 238c)

... ἀλλὰ τοῖς φίλοις
τοιούτους εἰμι δὴ τις ἢ τύπτεσθαι μῦθος
τύπτειν κεραυνός, ἐκτυφλοῦν τιν' ἀστραπή, κ.τ.λ.

Read ἀπτεσθαι for τύπτεσθαι, placing a comma after *tis*, and all runs smoothly—'I am hot iron to touch,' that is, to be touched, like *καλὸς ἰδεῖν*. On p. 125 (= 282d) Kaibel notes 'extrema corrupta' to a line of Epicharmos about the sturgeon,

τὸν τε πολυτίματον ἔλοπ' ὁ δ' αὐτὸς χαλκὸς ὄνιος.

But is it not possible that there may have been a word *χάλξ* = a bronze coin, of which *χαλκός* here is the genitive of price?

Perhaps Kaibel's best emendation is on p. 84 (= 263a) where in the clause καὶ τέλλα τὰ κέλουθα ἔπειτα ἀλέσας ἐξέτισεν αὐτοὺς he reads ἐπιτελέσας for ἔπειτα ἀλέσας.

JOHN B. BURY.

Die Attische Beredsamkeit; Von Gorgias bis zu Lysias. F. BLASS. 2nd Edition, 1887.
Leipzig: Teubner. 14 Mk.

IN 1865 Friedrich Blass, who had then lately completed his course as a student at Bonn, published at the early age of two and twenty an interesting sketch of the history of Greek eloquence during the period of its decline, between the death of Demosthenes and the age of Augustus. Only three years afterwards appeared the first volume of his great work on Attic Eloquence, giving a connected and comprehensive account of its development from the time of Gorgias to that of Lysias. The volume on Isocrates and

Isaeus followed in 1874, that on Demosthenes in 1877, and that on his contemporaries in 1880. This admirable series of volumes is well known to scholars as giving a complete account of the history of the subject. Before their appearance the field was occupied by Westermann's work on the History of Oratory in Greece and Rome, containing in a compact form a great store of references and authorities on the subject, but supplying materials and hints for a connected history rather than the history itself. From such a work, valuable as it still may be for purposes of reference, it is a relief to turn to the far more readable volumes of Professor Blass, which have deservedly won the widest recognition and have given a fresh impulse to the study of the subject, both in Germany and elsewhere. It is to be remembered that they are by no means confined to the literary criticism of the *Attic Orators* alone, but, in accordance with their title, cover the whole field of *Attic Oratory*. Thus in the first volume, which has lately reached a second edition, we have as many as fourteen pages on Thrasymachus and nearly forty on Thucydides. In the new edition the author refers to all the dissertations that have appeared during the last twenty years so far as they deserve mention in connexion with his own work, the best among these being Professor Jebb's *Essay on the Speeches of Thucydides*, which was first published in *Hellenica*, and has since been translated into German, and F. Berbig's pamphlet on the *genus dicendi tenue* of Lysias. The discussion of the date of the birth of Lysias has been slightly altered and expanded, with the general result that whereas in the former edition 440 B.C. was provisionally adopted, instead of the date of Dionysius (459), we now have it placed in '446 B.C. or later.' To Lysias are devoted more than 300 pages, or nearly half the volume; and, as in the former edition, this is the most interesting and valuable part of the work. All the speeches that have come down to us under the name of that orator are passed in review, with a sufficient account of their purport and with elaborate criticisms on their style. In dealing with the style of Lysias the author naturally quotes Cicero's description of the *tenue orator*, and refers to Cicero's remarks on the *tria genera dicendi*, the *tenue*, the *medium*, and the *grave*. But in connexion with the last he uses, on p. 391² = 381¹, the word *granditer*, which is not really found in Cicero, but is confined to verse and post-Augustan prose; it would therefore be best to alter it into *gravior*. On p. 248² = 243¹, in quoting Juvenal vii 203, he prints *Thrasymachi* instead of *Tharsymachi*, which the editors generally prefer for metrical reasons in the line beginning *Sicut Tharsymachi probat exitus*. But as a whole the new edition has been most carefully revised. By judicious retrenchment of some superfluous portions it has been shortened to the total extent of sixteen pages. Meanwhile, room has been found for many minor additions, and the work in its new form is thoroughly worthy of the author's high reputation.

J. E. SANDYS.

Aufsätze zur persischen Geschichte, von TH. NÖLDEKE. 8vo. Leipzig, Weigel. 1887. (German version of the articles PAHLAVI, PERSEPOLIS and part of PERSIA in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. 9th. ed. vol. xviii. 1885). 4 Mk.

THESE articles, which now appear in German, and in separate form, by the courtesy of Messrs. A and C. Black, the proprietors of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, have undergone a final revision by the author, but do not present any feature to distinguish them

substantially from the earlier English publication. In this respect they differ from the posthumous *Geschichte Persiens von Alexander bis zum Untergang der Arsaciden* of the late Prof. Gutschmid, which is much less condensed than the close-packed section of the *Encyclopaedia* article PERSIA to which it corresponds. Nöldeke's share in this article embraces the Median, Achaemenian, and Sāsānian empires, periods of history which are full of interest to the classical student, but gain much by being treated from the point of view of an oriental scholar. For the Sāsānian period the oriental sources are of the first importance, and among these must be included not only the inscriptions and coins but above all the Syriac and Arabic records. As editor of the corresponding part of Tabari's great chronicle, which he has accompanied by a translation and by notes of very great learning and historical value (*Geschichte der Perser und Araber aus Tabari*, 8vo. Leyden, 1879), Prof. Nöldeke has had the chief share in making these new lights available for the historian, and his supreme authority on the Sāsānian period is undisputed. The result of his researches is now presented in a clear and continuous narrative.

For the Achaemenians the eastern sources are less copious; but Prof. Nöldeke has used the latest photographic copies of the Old Persian Inscriptions (cf. his *Bemerkungen* on these in the *Persepolis* of Andreas and Stolze, 2 vols. fol. Berlin, 1882), and his knowledge of eastern antiquity throws much valuable light on a record which classical scholars generally approach from too western a standpoint. The essay on Persepolis is an important critical study resting on the most recent explorations. The short papers on Pahlavi or Pehlevi and on the names Persia and Iran supply in a convenient form information of a trustworthy kind on subjects that no classical scholar can afford to ignore.

W. ROBERTSON SMITH.

Didascalia CCCXVIII Patrum Pseudepigrapha, E Graecis Codicibus Recensuit PETRUS BATTIFOL, Coptico Contulit HENRICUS HYVERNAT. Parisiis. Leroux. 1887. 3 frcs.

M. BATTIFOL has used for his edition of the *Didascalia* three Greek MSS., which have been hitherto unknown, and which he describes as (P.) Parisinus 1087, (M.) Marciianus 498, both of the fourteenth century, and (R.) Regius = Parisinus gr. 1053, of the tenth. M. Hyvernât has added the readings found in the Turin Coptic MS. (tenth century), which differ from those of the Greek MSS.; and he has given them, in a Greek translation, in an appendix. It was not the intention of the editors to make use of all the material available for a new edition: 'sat erit hic Didascaliam graecam recensuisse,' they state (p. 19). They have omitted to consult the earlier editions of this book, as well as the Coptic *Codex Borgianus* at Naples. But in spite of the limits which they have imposed upon their enterprise, the editors have furnished a text which is in the main far correcter than that hitherto received. The *Didascalia* opens with the Nicene Creed (omitting, however, the words *ἐνανθρώπησαν* after *σαρκωθέντα* sc. *ὡν* l. 8, and *ἡ κτιστὸν* before *τρεῖς* l. 13); there follows the interpretation of the symbols bearing on Christology and the doctrine of the Trinity; the second part of the book contains rules and precepts intended to regulate the life 'of bishops and clerics and monks, and all the other Christians' (Chaps. I.—VIII. pp. 10—18). M. Battifol's statement respecting the origin of the *Didascalia* is open to criticism on two points. He says that this book is a Greek translation from the Coptic, and that the Coptic itself is a version

of the Athanasian tract *Syntagma doctrinae ad monachos* (Migne XXVIII. 835). But the first—the dogmatic—part of the *Didascalia* is closely allied to *Athanasii interpretatio in symbolum* (Migne XXVI. 1232). And as to the second part, Eichhorn, to whom we are indebted for this last remark, maintains (*Theol. Literatur Zeit.*, 1887, N. 24, p. 570), on the authority of Revillout, that the present *Syntagma* cannot have been the original, whence the Coptic version was made, but that the *Syntagma* formed part of the acts of the Alexandrine Council 362, and was afterwards revised and made into a separate treatise, which has been handed down to us. The *Didascalia* has the value of a document which bears on the theology of the fourth century; its main importance, however, lies in the fact that it throws light on the early history of monastic life and institutions. It contains, as has been recently pointed out, numerous quotations from the *Teaching of the Apostles*. A comparison of texts has shown us the main parallels to be—*Didascal. I.*, l. 12–14 comp. *Didache I.* 2. *DI. I.*, l. 14–16 comp. *DD. II.* 2. *DI. I.*, l. 17, 18 comp. *DD. VI.* 1. Some of the terms in *DI. I.* l. 24–27 are evidently taken from *DD. II.* 4, III. 5, 6. The commandment *τὰ σάββατα μὴ φυλάττειν καθάπερ Ἰουδαῖοι*, *DI. II.* l. 3, and the other injunction *μὴ παράβαινε τὴν ἡμέραν κυρίου, τούτῳσι τετράδα καὶ παρασκευὴ*, *II. l.* 13, refer most probably to *DD. VIII.* 1. The order given to all Christians to 'fear above all the words of the Lord,' *DI. IV.* 1, seems but a repetition of *DD. III.* 8; and that given to monks to learn a handicraft or to work on the fields, *DI. VI.* 4, lest they eat the bread of idleness, and to give the firstfruits to the priests, *DI. VI.* 9, seems taken from *DD. XII.* 3, 4, and *XIII.* 3. (Comp. *Apostol. Constit. VII.* 29). An inquiry into the manner, however, in which the injunctions given to primitive Christian congregations in the *Didache* have been enlarged into rules and regulations for monastic settlers in the *Didascalia* would require a separate monograph.

CHARLES MERK.

Critica Biblica. Le Recensioni dei LXX. e la versione detta Italia. Nota del M. E. ABATE A. CERIANI, letta al R. Istituto Lombardo nell' adunanza del 18 febbrajo 1886 (Estratto dai Rendiconti del R. Istituto Lombardo, Serie II., vol. xix., fasc. iv.) pp. 7.

ST. JEROME in his preface to the book of Chronicles writes thus: 'Alexandria et Aegyptus in Septuaginta suis Hesychium laudat auctorem, Constantinopolis usque Antiochiam Luciani martyris exemplaria probat. Mediae inter has provinciae Palaestinae (or Palaestinae) codices legunt, quos ab Origene elaboratos Eusebius et Pamphilus vulgaverunt.' Until lately we did not possess the means of distinguishing these three recensions amongst the existing MSS. The Abbé Ceriani believes that he is in a position to do so now. The idea flashed upon him when he saw the facsimile of Cod. VIII. (Holmes) published in Dublin in 1880 (*Par Palimpsestorum Dublinensium*) a MS. manifestly written in Egypt. I will merely give his conclusions drawn from comparisons with the Coptic versions, the Commentary of S. Cyril Alex., etc. The MS. which seems to have generally preserved the Hesychian recension is Holmes 106. In the Prophets the MSS. which generally agree with 106, are XII. 26, 33, 86, 97, 198, 306 and some others. The Palestinian text is represented by the Chigian codex (88 Holmes and Parsons) codices IV. V., and the Hexaplar Syriac version. Some other codd. exhibit this recension more or less, either in text or margin. In several books of the Syro-hexaplar version the

subscriptions state that the version was made from copies, the subscription of which indicated that they were derived from MSS. of Origen's text, corrected by Eusebius and Pamphilus. Cod. 88 has similar subscriptions. The character of the text compared with Origen's own statement of his method confirms this.

Lucian's recension was recognised by Field and Lagarde independently, and Abbé Ceriani claims priority for himself as regards the text of some of the books. This is the text of Theodoret and Chrysostom. The only uncial containing it is a MS. of fragments of Isaiah published by Tischendorf *Monumenta Sacra*, Tom. i. p. 187-198. The cursives are 19, 82, 93, 108. Besides the agreement of these Codd. with Theodoret and Chrysostom, they have, with 82, 245, the peculiarity of commencing 3 Kings (= 1 Kings E.V.) at ch. ii. 12, as did the Codices of Diodorus and Theodoret, and as there is reason to believe that Lucian's Codices did also. Further, the text followed by Ulphilas in the extant fragments of Ezra and Nehemiah was that of 19, 93, 108, and he must have followed the text used at Constantinople. In Isaiah, beside 93 are 90, 144, 147, 233, 308; in Genesis, beside 19 and 108, 418. Vercellone had already pointed out the agreement with 19, 82, 93, 108 of the Latin margin of the Gothic Codex Legionensis. With this recension agree the Latin of S. Ambrose and that of the (so-called) *Speculum* of S. Augustine. According to Dr. Ceriani this is precisely the *Italia* referred to in the famous passage of S. Augustine, *Italia* becoming used in that region which was then officially called *Italia*, viz.: the northern part which afterwards formed the ecclesiastical province of Milan. The correctness of *Italia* as against the suggested *Italica* has been vindicated by Mommsen. (Corssen approves Bentley's conjecture *usitata*.)

T. K. ABBOTT.

Servii Grammatici qui feruntur in Vergilli Carmina Commentarii. Recensuerunt GEORGIUS THILO et HERMANNUS HAGEN. Vol. III. Fasc. i. In *Bucolica* et *Georgica* commentarii. Leipzig, Teubner. 1887. 10 Mk. 40.

This volume nearly completes Thilo's well-known edition of Servius. A concluding part will contain the Verona Scholia and the commentary of Philargyrius, edited by Hagen.

The preface to the volume before us contains an account of the Regensburg, Limoges (now Leyden) and Vatican manuscripts. The Limoges commentary, which contains the fuller versions generally known as Daniel's Servius, only extends, as we now have it, to *Georg.* i. 278. Its deficiencies are partly supplied by the Vatican commentary on the *Georgics*, which also has a number of additional notes introduced by the words *et aliter*. Ursinus added these *et aliter* notes on the *Georgics* to the notes of Junius Philargyrius on the *Eclogues*, which Politian had copied from the Laurentian MS. He then included all under the name of Philargyrius. They are now printed by Thilo in the text of his Servius. Thilo thinks that Politian copied the notes on the *Eclogues* bearing the name of Philargyrius from the Laurentian, and some of those on the *Georgics* from the Vaticanus; and that Ursinus, deceived by this, attributed to Philargyrius all the notes copied by Politian.

The quality of the additional notes in the *Vaticanus* varies very much, a fact which leads Thilo to attribute them to different authors.

In the notice of the earlier volumes of this edition published in my *Lectures and Essays* I observed that Thilo had not exhausted the points of contact between

Servius and Nonius, and taken too little notice of the coincidences between Servius and Verrius Flaccus (Festus and Paulus). The following instances, taken from the commentary on the *Eclogues* only, will show that the same observations apply to the present volume. The point is important, as bearing on the antiquity of the Servian tradition. E. i. 69 'Caespites,' id est terra cum propria herba evulsa. Paulus p. 45 Müller, *Caespes est terra in modum lateris cava cum herba*. E. ii. 46 'Calathis' Graecum est: nam Latine quasillum dicitur: Cicero in *Philippicis* &c. Paulus p. 47 'Calathos' Graeci, nos dieinus quasillos. Verrius then is the ultimate authority for the note of Servius, and for the fuller one on the same subject in Isidore xix. 29, 3. E. iii. 77 *Dicitur hoc sacrificium 'ambarvale,' quod arva ambiat victima*. Macrobius S. iii. 5, 7, *ambarvalis hostia est, ut ait Pompeius Festus, quae rei divinae causa circum arva ducitur ab iis qui pro frugibus faciunt*. Festus's note is abridged by Paulus p. 5, and joined with one on *amburbialis hostia* which is also in Servius.

E. v. 5, (L) 'Succedere' idem significat quod et 'subire,' id est penitus intrare. Nonius p. 403 M. glosses both *succedere* and *subire* by *ingredi*, quoting, as Servius does, *nostris succedere penetibus hospes*.

E. v. 37, 'Infelix' infecundum. Nonius p. 301 'felix' fecundus: Paulus p. 92, *felices arbores Cato dixit quae fructum ferunt, infelices quae non ferunt*.

E. vi. 7, 'Condere' componere: Paulus p. 57.

E. vi. 32, 'Liquidi' puri. Nonius p. 334 *liquidum est purum*.

E. vii. 24, 'Sacra pinus,' matri deorum consecrata. Nonius p. 397 'sacrum' sacram.

Ib. 33. The note on *sinum lactis* closely resembles that of Nonius p. 547.

It would be easy to add more instances: but the reader may be weary, and a few remarks are required on the text, towards emending which something still remains to be done. I hazard the following conjectures:—

E. ii. 8, 'Frigora,' i.e. aprica loca. For *aprica* read *opaca*.¹

E. vi. 26, *Haec autem omnia de Sileno ac Theopompo in eo libro qui Thaumasia appellatur conscripta sunt. Ipse autem (Vergilius) ad commendationem addidit*. Read *multa addidit*, *multa* having dropped out between *m* and *a*.

G. iii. 122, *Arionis (equi) ex Cerere, cuius odorinum Adrastus habuit*. Read *dominium*.

Ib. 148, *Dividit enim furia armenta, cum ab eo (ocstro) stimulantur*. Read *dira agit* for *dividit*.

G. iv. 448, 'Deum praecepta,' propter matrem hoc nomen. Read *propter matrem hoc monentem*.

H. NETTLESHIP.

DR. LOLLING'S *Hellenische Landeskunde und Topographie*, which forms part of the third volume of Dr. Iwan Müller's *Handbuch der klassischen Alterthumswissenschaft*, contains a complete and very accurate account, as far as the surface of the country and the dwelling-places of its inhabitants are concerned, of the geography of Greece Proper, and of the other lands which were inhabited by Greeks in antiquity. The information which it comprises has been gleaned from many quarters, carefully sifted, and compressed within the narrowest possible limits. The heights of the mountains, and the extent of the area of the districts, are carefully given, and the modern names, wherever these exist, are appended to the ancient names of sites of cities and features of the

¹ This emendation has been accepted by Thilo, to whom I communicated it some three months ago, before this notice was written.

ground. The account of each province is prefaced by a general sketch of its characteristics, and a notice of its inhabitants, after which the country itself is described in minute detail. It will readily be understood that such a work is useful for reference, and for consultation on special points, but is hardly suitable for continuous reading. Dr. Lolling is sternly self-denying in excluding all such elements as might infuse brightness into his subject, or contribute to make it interesting. Places which are important in history, or distinguished by beauty or grandeur, receive no more attention than those that are less conspicuous. Delphi is dismissed in four sentences, the waterfall of the Styx in one. The discovery and clearing out of the tunnel of Eupalinus at Samos, described by Herodotus, though it is one of the most remarkable pieces of archaeological exploration in modern times, is not even mentioned; but a reference is given to an article by Fabricius in the *Mittheilungen des deutschen archäologischen Institutes in Athen*, which gives full details respecting it. An exception, however, is made in favour of Athens, to the topography of which a separate monograph is devoted. The extreme compression of statement in some cases is liable to produce confusion in the reader's mind. Thus, in the account of Arcadia we are told that the modern name of the Alpheus is Ruphis, and, in the next sentence, that that of the Ladon is Ruphia. A few words of explanation would have made it clear, that the name Ruphia is applied to the Ladon until it joins the Alpheus, and afterwards to the combined waters of the two rivers. To say the truth, though we are unwilling to appear ungrateful for so sound a piece of work, yet we are doubtful whether such a delineation was needed, since the same subject had already been worked out in Bursian's *Geographie von Griechenland*, in which work, also, references to ancient authors are given, while they are altogether excluded from the present treatise. What we especially miss in Dr. Lolling's work is any attempt to give a *résumé* of general points connected with Greek geography. Of the eleven pages to which his introductory remarks are confined, all but three are devoted to the sources of our information on the

subject. Though the products of various districts are sometimes mentioned, there is no general account of the vegetation; and the climate and winds, notwithstanding their intimate connection with geography, are hardly noticed. Yet these questions have been fully discussed in Neumann and Partsch's *Physikalische Geographie von Griechenland*. The origin and meaning of names of places, too—a subject which has been worked out by E. Curtius for the promontories of Greece in his *Beiträge zur Geographischen Onomatologie der griechischen Sprache*, and by Angermann in his *Geographische Namen Altgriechenlands*—is almost entirely ignored. There is one part of Dr. Lolling's work, however, which deserves the highest praise. This is the bibliographical notices, which are appended to each section, and include numerous monographs and contributions to magazines, which might otherwise escape notice, and also a selection of those of the earlier works on the subject which still retain their value. In compiling summaries of this sort it is impossible to arrive at perfection; and we are surprised under the head of 'Macedonia' to find no mention of such important works as Von Hahn's *Reise von Belgrad nach Salonik und Reise durch die Gebiete des Drin und Wardar*, and Barth's *Reise durch das Innere der Europäischen Türkei*. But omissions like this are rare, and the wonder is that they are so few. We cannot help remarking, in conclusion, that the author makes much too light of Sir E. H. Bunbury's *History of Ancient Geography*, when he speaks of it as a mere compilation from earlier works. To us it seems the greatest contribution to the subject that has appeared in modern times.

H. F. T.

Henri Kiepert. Manuel de Géographie Ancienne, traduit par ÉMILE ERNAULT. 6 frs.

This is a pleasantly written and printed translation of Kiepert's smaller geography, of which an English version already exists. The only special feature of it is that the section referring to France has been taken from Kiepert's larger work, and a few patriotic corrections made by M. Longnon.

NOTES.

NOTES ON AP. RHOD. with reference to Liddell and Scott:—AP. RH. I. 378, 379.

ὅτι δ' ἔρ' ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα μεταστρέφαντες ἔρετρά
πήχιον προχόντα περὶ σκαλμοῖσιν ἔβησαν.

These lines have been made rather difficult by an interpretation of Et. Magn. adopted by L. and S. *sub verb.* *πήχιος*, as follows: 'II. as Subst. = τροπήρη AP. RH. I. 379, cf. E. M. 671, 8.' Turning to E. M. we find *πήχιον προχόντα*, *Απολλώνιος*. οἱ μὲν, μικρὸν ἱμαντίδιον τὸ συνέχον τὴν κώπην πρὸς τὸν σκαλμὸν ὅπερ Ἀττικοὶ πηχναλία καλοῦσι. οἱ δὲ, τὸ ὅπισθεν μέρος τῆς κώπης ὅπερ κατέχον ὁ ναῦτης κομπλατεῖ. Of whatever value the first explanation may be in itself it is pretty certain that *πήχιον* has not the meaning of *τροπήρη* here, and I can only account for the statement by supposing that l. 379 having been taken from the context, it became necessary to assign some new meaning to *πήχιον*. It is however translated by Beck 'lorum prominens scalmis alligant,' and also by Shaw, though his opinion is not of much weight. But in 392 we read *σκαλμοῖς δ' ἀμφὶς*

ἔρετρά καθήρτων and this has led Matthiae to reject 378, 379 as spurious. But there is really no difficulty in these lines as Wellauer observes *ad. loc.*, and the second explanation of E. M. helps us to the meaning of *μεταστρ. ἔρ.* in 378. The launch of Argo is being described. After she has been placed upon the rollers it is necessary of course to move her into the water. With this object the oars are placed on each side with their handles projecting a cubit's length beyond the rowlock (*μεταστ. ἔ. π. πρ.*) and are there temporarily fastened to the thole-pins. In this way the Argonauts have each a cubit's length of oar handle to push at and they stand in order on each side and push accordingly, as is described 380 foll. Then when Argo has reached the water, the oars are released from their peculiar position and affixed to the thole-pins in the usual manner. The second explanation given by E. M. then really points to the words *μεταστρέφαντες ἔρετρά* and not to *πήχιον* while the first explanation seems, as Merkel remarks, to be made for the occasion. *πήχιον* occurs three times in AP. RH. in its usual meaning of *πηχναῖον* viz. iii. 854,

1207 (where it answers to *πυγούσιον* of *Od.* x. 517) and iv. 1510. There is unfortunately a gap in the Schol. to Ap. Rh. here or perhaps L. and S. would not have taken E. M. as their guide.

'*ἀμύρτος* not to be drawn out i.e. tedious γῆρας, Ap. Rh. ii. 221.' This seems rather contradictory. In the line quoted *ἀμ.* goes with *ἐς τέλος* and means 'not to be drawn to an end' and so 'tedious,' *ἀτέλειστον* and *διηκεῖς ἐπιμένον*, *ἀπέραντον* Schol. adding that the metaphor is *ἀπὸ τῶν μυημένων ἐρίων*. If the Homeric *ἰστία μυρίεσθαι* gives the proper meaning of the word *μ.* a different metaphor is suggested.

'*εὐκλος*, *ον* and Ap. Rh. η. *ον*.' A mistake through following Brunck's reading in ii. 935 from an inferior MS., and in iii. 769, iv. 61, 1247, even Brunck has the word of two terminations. L. and S. usually follow Brunck's reading in citing Ap. Rh. though his text is now quite discredited.

'*μαιμάω* . . . c. gen. *χείρα μαιμάωσαν φόνον*, eager for murder Soph. *Αἴ.* . 50, so *μαιμάωσαι ἐθνήτος* Ap. Rh. ii. 269.' In the line of Ap. Rh. quoted *μ.* does take the gen. but it is elsewhere used by him absolutely as in Hom., but in Soph. *φόνον* evidently depends on *ἐπέσχε* as Prof. Jebb points out.

'*ὑποφήτωρ* = *ὑποφήτης*. *ὑπ. αἰδῆς Μούσαι* Ap. Rh. i. 22, 'rather *ὑποφήτωρ* is here the correlative of *ὑποφήτης*. The Muses are the 'suggesters of the song to the poet, and so in iv. 1381 he calls himself *ὑπακούς Πιερίδων*. The poet is *Μουσῶν ὑποφήτης* and *προφήτης*.

R. C. SEATON.

* *

CONTRIBUTIONS TO STRABO'S BIOGRAPHY.

1. *Writings*. In all recognised books of reference two works are given to Strabo, viz. the Geography (*Γεωγραφικά*) in 17 books, which is still extant, and an Historical work (*Ἱστορικά ὑπομνήματα*) now lost.

Now it will hardly seem credible if I state that Strabo himself distinctly mentions two separate historical works of his own. Yet such however is the fact. The oversight of scholars can only be accounted for by supposing that, as the passage occurs in Bk. XI. 515, readers do not as a rule advance so far in the work. It is as follows: *εἰρηκότες δὲ πολλὰ περὶ τῶν Παρθικῶν νομῶν ἐν τῇ ἑκτῇ τῶν ἱστορικῶν ὑπομνημάτων βίβλῳ, δευτέρα δὲ τῶν μετὰ Πολύβιον, παραλείψομεν ἐν ταῦθα μὴ ταυτολογεῖν δέωμεν κ.τ.λ.* From this it is perfectly plain that the *Ἱστορικά ὑπομνήματα*, and the *Τὰ μετὰ Πολύβιον* are two distinct works. To the first of these two works he evidently refers in Bk. II. 70: *καὶ ἡμῖν δὲ ὑπῆρξεν ἐπὶ πλέον κατιδεῖν ταῦτα ὑπομνηματιζομένοις τὰς Ἀλεξάνδρου πράξεις*. Now the History of Polybius extended down to 146 B.C.: therefore Strabo's continuation would not begin before that date. It is plain then that in this work there could have been no place for a description of the exploits of Alexander (336-323 B.C.), but, as the word *ὑπομνηματιζομένοις* implies, they were comprised in his *ὑπομνήματα*. Suidas s.v. *Πολύβιος* (a reference which I owe to Sir E. H. Dunbury's *Ancient Geography* says: *Ἰστὶον ὅτι διαδέχεται τὴν Πολυβίου ἱστορίαν Ποσειδώνιος Ὀλβιοπολίτης, σοφιστὴς ἔγραψε δὲ καὶ Στράβων Ἀμασιεύς τὰ μετὰ Πολύβιον ἐν βιβλίοις μγ'.*

Pernahardy seems hardly justified in removing this passage from the text in his edition of Suidas (Halle 1853). Certainly as far as Strabo is concerned it is in complete harmony with the passage quoted above.

Plutarch (*Lucullus* 28) refers to Strabo's *Memoirs* and also in *Sulla* 26 to Strabo as an historian, but without quoting the name of any work.

Josephus often refers to him, but without mentioning the title of the work from which he quotes.

2. *Where did Strabo write his Geography?* Scholars long assumed that Strabo after visiting Rome (29 A.D.) and making a long sojourn in Egypt returned home to his native city of Amasea in Pontus, and there wrote his Geography. This involved various difficulties. For instance, Strabo knows but little about the countries lying east of Pontus. In fact Herodotus writing 400 years earlier has better information respecting the Caspian. On the other hand he introduces various incidents relating to Italy which must have occurred very shortly before his death. He likewise makes use of the work of an anonymous writer whom he calls *ὁ χωρογράφος*, and whose work he seems to indicate by the term *ἡ χωρογραφία*. As all distances quoted from this source are given in miles it is inferred that the writer was a Roman. Some had thought that the chorography referred to the great work of Agrippa, but as the latter died in 12 B.C. and as the work was not completed until after his death, it would have been impossible for Strabo to have seen it, assuming the supposed date of his sojourn at Rome to be correct. Now Mullenhoff (*Über die Weltkarte und Kosmographie des Kaisers Augustus*, p. 2) first suggested that Strabo wrote at Rome, but offered no proofs. Niese (*Hermes* 1878, p. 36) sought to prove this hypothesis by three passages (VII, 290, XIII, 590, XIII, 609). But the inference that Strabo was at Rome because he used the terms *ἐνθάδε* and *δεῖρο* in reference to that city is hardly tenable, as it is his habit to use these words in immediate reference to the place of which he is at that moment treating as in VI. 257, 281. But we can find much more reliable evidence in the passage (V. 236) where he describes the Tomb of Augustus: *ἀξιολογώτατον δὲ τὸ Μανσάλειον καλούμενον ἐπὶ κρηπίδος ὑψηλῆς λευκολίθου πρὸς τῷ ποταμῷ χῶμα μέγα, ἔχει κορυφῆς τοῖς ἀειθαλέσι τῶν δένδρων συννεφεῖς ἐπ' ἄκρῳ μὲν οὖν εἰκὼν ἐστὶ χαλκῇ τοῦ Σεβαστοῦ Καίσαρος, ὑπὸ δὲ τῷ χῶματι θήκαι εἰσὶν αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν συγγενῶν καὶ οἰκείων, ὅπισθεν δὲ μέγα ἄλσος περιπάτους θανμαστός ἔχον' ἐν μεσῷ δὲ τῷ πεδίῳ ὁ τῆς Καίσαρος αὐτοῦ περίβολος καὶ οὗτος λίθου λευκοῦ, κύκλῳ μὲν περικείμενον ἔχων σιδηροῦν περίφραγμα, ἐντὸς δ' αἰγείοις κατάφροντος*. This has all the appearance of being the description of an eyewitness, the evergreens, the iron palings, the poplars would hardly have been put in, if Strabo had been writing far away in Pontus. Augustus died 14 A.D. It seems then that Strabo was living at Rome after that date.

In fact it is probable that he returned to Rome from Egypt. At all events there was no reason why he should return to Pontus; with the fall of Mithradates the fortunes of his family were broken. The reason why his information respecting the region of the Caspian is so scanty is now obvious, and there can be little doubt that "the chorography" is the famous work of Agrippa.

As we find Strabo at Rome so shortly before the time when in the course of nature he must have died, it is not unreasonable to conjecture that he died there.

WILLIAM RIDGEWAY.

* *

CATULLUS, lxi. 22-24.

O nimis optato saeculorum tempore nati
 Heroes salvet deum genus! o bona matrum
 Progenies salvet iterumque iterumque bonarum:
 Vos ego saepe meo vos carmine compellabo.

The third line is given according to Munro's restoration. The turn of the last line is not a Latin one. I know of no instance of epianalepsis of this sort, where the epithet is in one clause (*meo*), the noun (*carmine*) in another. Two nouns are clearly demanded and long ago I suggested *mero* for *meo*. The correction seemed to me so obviously right as to need no demonstration, but as it has been neglected I wish to add some illustrations which I hope will recommend it to Mr. Ellis.

Te multa prece, te prosequitur *mero*.

Hor. *Carmin.* iv. 5, 33.

Ter tibi fit libo, ter dea casta *mero*—Tibull. iv. 6, 14.
Sic noctem *paterna*, sic ducam *carminē*.

Prop. iv. 6, 85.

Libatum fundens ad tua sacra *merum*.

Prop. iii. 17, 38.

Superis...tura *merumque* damus.—Ov. *Ep.* 21, 91.

Festa dies Veneremque vocat, *cantusque merumque* :
haec decet ad dominos munera ferre deos.

Ov. *Am.* iii. 10, 47.

Et 'bene nos patriae, bene te pater optime Caesar,'
dicite, suffuso per sacra verba *mero*.

Ov. *Fast.* ii. 637.

Da mihi tura, puer,.....
quodque pio fusum stridat in igne *merum*.
Ov. *Trist.* v. 5, 11 (on his mistress's birthday).

A. PALMER.

* *

CATULLUS, xlii. 12, 13.—The difficulty of this passage is well known. *O* gives it as follows

qui modo scurra

Aut siquid ac retristius videbatur.

May not the right reading be *aure tritius*? This suggested itself to me on reading Longin. *Act. Rhet.* p. 137, Bake, τῆς δ' εὐρυθμίας τὸ γνῶρισμα δῆλον τῷ συνεισμένῳ τὸ τῶν εὐρύθμων καὶ ἀποτετορνευμένων καὶ στρογγύλων ἀποδέχασθαι λόγων, καὶ τετριμμένων τὰ ὅλα πρὸς τὴν σύνθεσιν τῶν τε σεμνῶν καὶ ἀρχαίων λόγων ὧν κατέλεξα τοὺς εὐρετὰς καὶ πρῶτους φήναντας τὰ παραδείγματα τῆς καλλιλογίας.

Cicero uses *tritae aures* of the trained ears of a Platine critic, Vitruvius (ii. i. 6) *tritiores manus* of hands acquiring by practice increased dexterity in building. Longinus' *τετριμμένος τὰ ὅλα* exactly expresses *aure tritior*, 'more practised of ear,' i.e. for detecting the true ring of genuine wit and distinguishing it from anything inconsonant, as bad taste or rusticity.

ROBINSON ELLIS.

* *

PERSIUS, Sat. III. 29.

'Censoremve tuum vel quod trabeate salutas?'

Conington's note on this line is as follows:—

'*Ve...vel* is apparently an unexampled tautology. Many MSS. have "censoremque," which does not help the sense, and is itself less likely. One has

"censoremne," which Casaubon wished to read, explaining it "vel eone tibi places quod." Heintz conj. "censorem fatuum," which he thinks may stand for Claudius.'

I would suggest 'censorem vetulum.' 'Do you pride yourself on passing in review in your purple knight's cloak before some wizened censor?'

H. B. STANWELL.

[Is it not possible to take *ve* and *vel* as expressing two distinct alternatives, 'or because you have a kinsman who is a censor, or because you are yourself a knight:' in full, *censoremve quod tuum salutas, vel quod trabeate censorem salutas*?—J. B. M.]

* *

JUVENAL, Sat. XI. 106.

The words

ac nudam effigiem clipeo venientis et hasta
pendentisque dei

do not seem capable of a satisfactory interpretation. To join *clipeco* with *venientis*, and to render 'coming with shield,' seems to strain the powers of the ablative case to the utmost. The comment of Servius on Georg. iv. 484, Ixionii *vento* rota constitit orbis, to the effect that *vento* is equivalent to *cum vento*, is not generally accepted: and if we should adopt it, it may be doubted whether the 'accompanying ablative' there bears any very close analogy to the ablative quoted from Juvenal.

Nor is the passage given as parallel, *venit et agresti capitis Silvanus honore*, an exact parallel at all: for *honore* (combined with *agresti*) is a qualifying or descriptive ablative, taken closely with *Silvanus*, as the rhythm of the verse shows, and not in connection with *venit*. But in the line from Juvenal, the rhythm determines that *clipeco* and *hasta* go closely with the participle. And this should disprove the possibility of taking *nudam* with *clipeco et hasta*; although we are reminded that Ovid (*Fasti* iii. ad. init.) represents the War God as *unarmed* when he visited Rea Silvia.

Now the Cod. Pitheaeus and the Scholl. concur in the reading *venientis*; but inferior MSS. give *fulgentis*. If the line be set up in uncials

CLIPEOVENIENTISETHASTA

it is easy to see that the three letters underlined may well represent the conjunction QVE, the final O of *clipeco* having fallen out from its similarity to the uncial Q. This emendation would leave *clipecoque nitentis et hasta*; and that *nitentis* represents *nitentis* may be inferred from the reading of the later MSS. *fulgentis*, which probably came in from the margin, where it was placed as a reminder that *nitentis* was to be referred to *niteo* and not to *nitor*.

The line, as corrected, will then run

ac nudam effigiem clipecoque nitentis et hasta
pendentisque dei;

and all difficulties of interpretation will disappear.

W. W. MERRY.

CLASSICAL EDUCATION IN GERMANY.

(Translated from the German original.)

LETTER I.

SIR,—You ask me for a paper for your Review dealing with Classical Studies in Germany, as you have had one dealing with Classical Education in France, and you refer me to the Article by my French Colleague in the July number of the Classical Review as to the lines which my paper should follow. I will endeavour to imitate his clear and thorough exposition, and will answer the same questions as he has done, though not perhaps in the same order: for the order depends partly on the nature of the subject-matter, and this differs in each case. A writer dealing with education in France has this advantage that, apart from the different nature of different schools, the whole Republic is thoroughly centralised: while in Germany one has to consider not only the different kinds of schools, but also the different plans of instruction in the separate States. I do not indeed complain of this want of unity, except as a difficulty in the way of one writing on the state of education; on the contrary I see in it a great advantage to our country and people. It is no loss to have various modes of operation within the same system of national education; it is indeed a gain, especially when the different races have found that which suits them best in these different forms of the common national ideal of education, and have shaped it to suit their own character. Besides, too much must not be made of this variety: since the establishment of the German Empire in 1870 we have not indeed attained complete uniformity, but we have to some extent agreed as to the leading principles. At a meeting of delegates of the governing bodies of all higher schools in the German Empire held at Dresden in 1872, the principle was established that the leaving certificates (*Abiturienten-Zeugnisse*) of all German schools should be made of equal value, provided that the schools conformed to certain external conditions. To carry this principle into practice a Commission was appointed of delegates from the different states—*Reichsschulkommission*—with no power to exercise direct interference with the educational authorities in the different states, but, on the other hand, with power to name the schools which are authorised to grant certificates for ¹*Abiturienten* and ²*Einjährig-Freiwillige*. The Commission thus gained a certain right of watching over education; and in like manner the schools which grant these certificates are led to reform and develop themselves more uniformly than before. With regard to the differences which continue to exist in spite of an ever-increasing uniformity, I shall only be able to notice points which are of real importance.

With regard to the instruction in the Gymnasium, it makes no difference, so far as the study of the classical languages is concerned, whether it is a State-gymnasium, or a Commune-gymnasium, a secular or an ecclesiastical institution. That depends on the plan on which the school was founded: it is also a question of finance, and in part a personal question: but the instruction and the arrangement of the school is the same in all cases. The peculiarities of different schools depending on the Head-Master's personality have almost entirely

¹ *Abiturienten* are those pupils of the highest class, who through an examination are qualified for the University.

² *Einjährig-Freiwillige* are those who through the certificate of some higher school have obtained the right of doing military service for one year instead of three.

disappeared: we have official schemes of instruction, and regulations for *Abiturienten*, which exert their influence on all the schools of one particular State and leave scarcely any noticeable peculiarities. The spirit of each school is, however, in reality that of its Head-Master, or (especially in South Germany) that of the whole staff of teachers. But we have various kinds of schools with various aims and plans of instruction: of these only two demand our attention, the *Gymnasium* and the *Real-gymnasium*, at both of which classical studies are pursued, though to a different extent. But there is a further difference: beside the complete *Gymnasia* and *Real-gymnasia*, with nine, in Würtemberg ten, classes, stand the *Progymnasia* and *Real-progymnasia*, with seven or six classes, which therefore do not provide instruction for the two or three last years at school: again, below these, and apart from them, are the so-called Latin schools, principally in Würtemberg, which only extend to the Tertia, and therefore have not the four or five highest classes: the study of the ancient languages is here also essentially the same as in the lower classes of a complete *Gymnasium*. The fact is that these incomplete schools make all sorts of concessions to the local exigencies of small towns; consequently their achievements fall considerably behind those of the complete schools in many respects, but, on the other hand, they raise the general level of culture among the people of such little towns in a satisfactory way.

A boy generally enters the *Gymnasium* when he has completed his ninth year—in Würtemberg, with its ten-year course, a year earlier—so that under ordinary circumstances the boy leaves school at eighteen to go to the University. But this, the normal, course is gradually becoming exceptional, and the average age for leaving school is in most states considerably higher. The condition of admission into the lowest class is the possession of the power of reading and writing and of making correct calculations with any numbers up to 1,000. Where this knowledge is acquired is not of consequence to the *Gymnasium*: in small towns it is without exception attained in the common schools, in large towns either with private teachers or in elementary schools constructed for the purpose or in preparatory schools connected with the *Gymnasia*; this connexion however is no advantage. The number of pupils in each class of the *Gymnasium* differs with time and place: it ought not to exceed 40 or, at most, 50 in the lowest classes, 30 in the highest. The number of school hours in the week is also not the same in the different States: it varies between 28 and 35 in the various classes. The chief subjects in strictly humanistic *Gymnasia*—as distinguished from *Real-gymnasia*—are German, Latin, Greek, and Mathematics: subjects of secondary importance are History and Geography, Natural Science, French, Religion, Drawing, and Gymnastics. English and Hebrew are optional. In some South German schools Philosophy (Logic and Psychology) is among the compulsory subjects. The system of having different teachers for different subjects was formerly carried too far: now, however, we are trying to give each master, at all events in the lower classes, as many lessons and subjects as possible in his own class. But of the opposition of the two systems I had better speak later.

We have here only to do with the teaching of the two ancient languages. I shall speak first of Latin in the *Gymnasium*, adding a few words on the study of this subject in the *Real-Gymnasium*. Greek I shall treat in my next letter. Latin is begun as soon as the pupil enters the lowest class (Sexta): the number of hours given to it in this class in each week is in Bavaria and Alsace-Lorraine 7, in Württemberg 12, in Prussia 9. The total number of hours in the week devoted to Latin by the *Gymnasium* amounts, if the hours given to the subject in all the classes be added together, to 71 in Alsace-Lorraine (the lowest), 102 in Württemberg (the highest), 77 in Prussia.

The aim of the teacher of Latin is stated in the Prussian Educational Scheme of March 31, 1882, as follows: "[To secure] a sound knowledge of Latin Accidence and Syntax. That the pupil should gain a vocabulary sufficient for the understanding of the writings of the classical period (excepting those which deal with technical matters), a vocabulary which he will retain for his later special studies and which will form a foundation for the understanding of the modern languages derived from Latin.—The reading of a selection of the most important works of classical literature which are suited to the pupil's powers; a grammatically accurate understanding of these works is to be demanded: the pupil is to advance to a grasp and appreciation of the subject-matter and the style. The writing of Latin, within the range of thought covered by the reading, without serious incorrectness and with some ease is also required."

Let us begin with the teaching of grammar. The accidence is, speaking generally, completed in the first two school years. The regular accidence falls to the Sexta, the irregular to the Quinta, so far as they can in practice be kept distinct. In the Quarta the work of the two lower classes is repeated and the Syntax begun, the chief rules being given in an elementary form. The lower and upper Tertia have to go over the same ground with more thoroughness and depth, the former perfecting the treatment of the Cases, the latter that of the Moods and Tenses in principal and subordinate sentences. But the knowledge gained in these classes is not so sure as to make it unnecessary to repeat the work in the Secunda and Prima in a more thorough and intelligent form, an opportunity thus occurring for pointing out the underlying historical connexion of the facts. Style is seldom taught in special lessons: opportunities enough for the treatment of the subject occur in connexion with grammar, reading, and written exercises. I have spoken of the teaching of grammar first, and by itself, for various reasons: first, it forms in the lower classes an important and almost independent subject: then, the idea is more and more gaining ground that Latin is to be always 'der grammatische Knecht': grammatical discipline in itself belongs to the teaching of Latin. German grammar is put in the background and is scarcely taught at all now in many schools, but the instruction in it is put into the Latin lessons, except that part of the subject which is directly connected with German reading. But, lastly, my chief reason for treating grammar separately: the higher one gets in the school, the less is the Latin reading to be mis-used as a grammatical exercise, or regarded as a collection of syntax-examples: rather it is to be pursued for its own sake and for the interest of the subject. It follows that grammatical instruction can only be regarded as relatively independent of reading through all the classes. There is no Grammar which is used in all German schools: that of Fr. Ellendt, revised by M. Seyffert, is the most common. It cannot be denied that it is

to some extent too lengthy: it will for this reason give way before long to a simpler and shorter book, which in its turn will accompany the pupil through all the classes.

From the grammatical part of the teaching I proceed to the translations and written exercises. Exercises in translation, both written and *viva voce*, from German into Latin and from Latin into German, generally go with grammatical instruction through the first two school years. In these classes and generally in those above them as far as the Tertia the pupils have printed translation books before them. Ostermann's are, as far as I know, the commonest. Latin and German pieces are given in nearly equal proportion. The necessary words are at the same time learnt by heart, being either printed beside each passage, or, as by Ostermann, in a separate book arranged with reference to the grammar. These vocabularies are, with justice, much blamed, because they give many words which the pupil does not meet in his later reading. Statistics of the words which occur in school-reading are urgently needed: they would also be helpful in rendering the school-grammar simpler. With reference to the translation passages there is a question which has been much debated of late, whether it is well to retain the hitherto common method of having sentences placed side by side without any internal connexion, or whether it would not be better to have connected passages of some interest and value, and especially selections from history. The latter plan seems at first sight to have the advantage; yet its claims rest in part on a misunderstanding of the aim of the teaching of Latin and on a failure to understand the gradual development of the youthful mind. The language is at first the one and only aim, and therefore it is a mistake to place beside it as an aim the increase of historical knowledge. Again, to the young beginner the language itself is, in fact, interesting enough: the strange word, the strange form awake and arrest his attention; and moreover the attempt to translate is still so difficult for him to make, that he has little attention left for the subject-matter; or else his interest in the subject-matter draws off his attention from the form of expression. But this proposal is founded on an idea concerning the instruction of the beginner in Latin, which is still more opposed to the method at present in use. It is said that the analytical-inductive method should be used in place of the synthetic; that, accordingly, the Latin sentence, the passage for translation should be taken as the medium and starting-point of grammatical instruction. This plan can boast great success in the teaching of French, especially in Baden. It is, to my mind, the only right method of teaching modern languages. But then the only object is to be able to understand the foreign language as soon as possible: in the case of Latin, on the other hand, the aim is to gain a sound and thorough grammatical discipline, for which the one-sided and exclusive application of the analytical method is neither advantageous nor sufficient. Accordingly the proposals of H. Perthes which point in this direction have been rejected by most German school-masters. Nevertheless this movement has been of great use to the cause of Latin instruction: a closer connexion between reading and grammar: a recognition of the analytical method of procedure, and of the necessity of its application in details, even when the former method is in general retained; the attaching of less importance to mechanical drill in grammar and unintelligent learning of vocabularies; the paying of greater attention to these questions of method and the recognition of the importance of

psychological observations to the science of teaching ; these were the happy results of a discussion which is not yet quite at an end.

But let us return to our subject, translation exercises. With the *viva voce* we must take the written exercises. The same method is almost universally adopted in the lower classes : besides the exercises done from printed books, generally given as home-work, we have what are called *Ectemporalia*. The teacher dictates a German sentence and the pupil has to write down the Latin for it at once. Two different aims are assigned for this practice : that of making the boys quick, and that of giving the teacher an opportunity of judging exactly of their attainments. Both these ends are reached, especially the first : but the most important aim is practice : to render this effectual these *Ectemporalia* must be carefully suited to the course of instruction and diligently prepared. To understand this fully we must anticipate and ask what ought to be the ultimate result of the written exercises. The Prussian Scheme of Education says quite rightly that they are "in the lower and middle classes an indispensable means for the thorough mastery of the grammar and vocabulary." But in the higher classes we require more, and here two systems stand opposed which influence the whole course of instruction from the very beginning in different ways : we have the Latin essay in Prussia and North Germany, Latin composition (*i. e.* translation of passages from modern writers, for instance, Mommsen) in Würtemberg. It is true that both systems require careful thinking from the pupils. But experience shows that the Latin essays consist in general of mere phrases put together, mosaic-fashion : the matter counts for nothing, the expression for everything. Cleverly to avoid the difficulties of subject-matter and even of expression, to collect, from the memory or even from note-books kept for the purpose, well-sounding phrases, to put them together with some skill and ease, and—which is the best point in the practice, but also the one least often reached—to give the whole a sort of Latin colouring and free it from gross Germanisms, that is the whole task. But the writing and speaking of Latin—for the two go closely together—are no longer attainable in our time, because they are no longer worth attaining. The Würtemberg system, on the other hand, has the advantage of demanding greater exertion : the spirit of the language must be struggled with ; it cannot in this case be avoided. Yet this practice, too, is in many respects a waste of time and strength ; even in the upper classes weight is laid only on the form of expression ; at an age when the mind desires above all things some solid food to quicken it, something which can really satisfy it, the formal expression is treated as an end in itself. Besides, the demands made by these pieces of composition often exceed the powers of boys of poor or moderate gifts. In opposition to both these systems, Baden contents itself with *Ectemporalia* even in the higher classes, considering them even there merely as helps to the attainment of a fairly complete knowledge of grammar without much effort. The closest connexion between these exercises and the reading done is required. Thus these written exercises, which in the lower classes are merely aids to the learning of grammar, become in the upper, together with grammar, aids towards reading ; they relieve the reading of the labour of grammatical study, and make it easier and more effectual. It is, however, of the utmost importance that the teacher should himself prepare the exercises each time. The use of printed exercise-books must be given up, and in their place exercises prepared by the teacher in connexion with the books read must

be set. Thus the system adopted in Baden, in my opinion the most rational, makes the smallest requirements of the boys in the way of Latin style, but demands of the teacher great skill in adapting the exercises to the books read and in applying the teaching to modern as well as to ancient subjects. The practice of talking Latin, common in the States in which Latin essays are required, and not altogether discarded in Baden, has a certain value, when only what has just been read is reproduced ; it is a good exercise, but it will certainly disappear from our schools as the fact, that talking Latin belongs to an age that is passed, becomes more recognised.

And now of the reading itself, which begins in the Quarta. Here again we are met at the outset by a disputed question, which implies a difference in the system of teaching. It is asked whether it is better to begin with a book of selections or with a Latin author. Those who prefer the first often use *Lhomond de viris illustribus urbis Romae*, of which my French colleague has already spoken ; in other schools selections from Livy, or the translations from Herodotus by Weller, are used. But on the whole, as far as my knowledge goes, Cornelius Nepos is most commonly used in the Quarta. The dubious character of his Latin, his slight gifts as a historian, the moral objection to some of his lives, are urged against him. But in the hands of an able teacher these faults of the collection, which is the book for boys, lose their harmful effect, especially if the lives are rightly chosen ; for it is not possible to master them all in this class, where boys begin their Latin reading. The preparation is done in school. From the Quarta to the Prima in the gymnasium the boy has to do preparation at home for the Latin and Greek lessons. This arrangement has lately been attacked by Fr. Paulsen in his *Geschichte des gelehrten Unterrichts* (1885), but, in my opinion, without justification. A good teacher will not make the home-work difficult by setting new work, but will require above all things the passages already translated to be read again, and will exact an easy and elegant German translation. In this way Latin and German teaching are combined. Indeed, in German schools all subjects in the end lead up to German. In some schools, though not in all, Phaedrus is read, together with Nepos, in the Quarta, rather as a foretaste of the poets, than as a real introduction to them.

In the Tertia the author throughout the two years is Caesar, the *Bellum Gallicum* being almost exclusively read. The authorities are certainly right in energetically protesting against a one-sided attention to the language of the Latin books read, especially at a stage at which there is generally danger that this may happen. They recommend that the subject-matter of the books should be treated as a whole, and used as material for German essays. There are many who urge objection to the use of Caesar as a school-book, but certainly in our military age the soldier-historian is suitable reading for future *Einjährig-Freiwillige* and officers of Reserve. The poet taken with Caesar is Ovid (the *Metamorphoses*), a thorough grounding in metrical knowledge being acquired while he is read. The boys learn to understand the hexameter and to read it, and gain their first knowledge of the language and diction of poetry, so far as it differs from prose. It was formerly the custom to write Latin verses, but this has now been given up altogether ; occasionally hexameters which have been broken up are put together again, in order to secure a clear insight into the metre. It cannot be denied that something has been lost through the discarding of verse-making ; the scanty knowledge of prosody possessed by the rising generation of teachers some-

times causes very undesirable mistakes in teaching. But it is not well that the necessary knowledge should be gained by the compulsory production of verses *invita Minerva*: the pronunciation of Latin should receive the fullest attention and the quantities should be accurately observed: and indeed great weight has been laid upon this point of late even in elementary teaching. We have not, however, made up our minds fully to adopt and maintain the historically correct pronunciation of Latin: C for instance is not pronounced as K. There is a not unreasonable fear that the fathers would raise a storm against the 'Stockphilologen.' Nor would this be a sign of a foolish and prejudiced opposition on the side of that which has long been established against that which is acknowledged to be better and more correct, but rather of the interest taken by the fathers in their sons' education. To take away this bond of sympathy by introducing a strange pronunciation would not be wise: it is a case in which a gradual reform is to be preferred, and is preferred by thoughtful schoolmasters, to a sudden revolution.

The chief author in the *Secunda* is Livy, Books xxi-xxiv being the greatest favourites. Books i and ii are also often read. Sallust is taken in the same class, the *Catilina* being read almost always in connexion with Cicero's speeches in *Catilinam*. The *Jugurtha*, on the other hand, is much less often read, which is in truth a great pity. Cicero's speeches are taken at the same time as these two historical writers or before them, the latter being especially the case in the States in which the Latin essay is written. In the *Secunda* the speeches most often read are the *De imperio Cn. Pompei* on account of its lucid arrangement, the *Pro Archia* for the richness of the language, and, as I mentioned above, the *Orationes in Catilinam* (generally only the second or third); further, the *Pro Milone*, *Pro Roscio Amerino* and *Pro Sulla*, the subject-matter of which arouses interest. Sometimes the *De Senectute* or the *De Amicitia* is read. The poet in the *Secunda* is Vergil who is read alongside of Homer: books i, ii, iv and parts of vi are especially read. The *Elogues* are rarely read, still more rarely episodes from the *Georgics*.

Cicero and Tacitus are the prose authors of the *Prima*. The *Germania* of the latter, often only the first half, is nearly always read, and very often the first two books of the *Annals*. The *Agricola* and parts of the *Historiae* are often mentioned in the School Programmes, but very few teachers follow the advice of the theorists that the *Dialogue* should be used as a school-book. Speeches of Cicero are read also in the *Prima*, the last two of the *Verrines* being particular favourites, especially the fourth, because it gives a good opportunity for introducing a general view of the chief epochs of the history of art, a subject which is at present struggling for admission into the school-course. But it seems better that it should be introduced as opportunities occur, in connexion with other subjects, as German reading (Lessing's *Laocoon*, *c. g.*) and history (the age of Pericles). Besides the *Verrines*, the *Pro Sestio* and some of the *Philippics* are often read in the *Prima*. The *Letters* are seldom read, as the matter requires too much explanation: but some teachers do not like to leave them out altogether. Opinion is divided between the philosophical and rhetorical writings; the Alsace-Lorraine Scheme of Education of June 20, 1883, prefers the former and excludes the latter: wrongly, as it seems to me. Rhetoric is Cicero's own subject: in that field he is master; while in philosophy he is only a dilettante, who cannot even plagiarise without making mistakes. Yet one finds the *Tusculans* and

De Officiis much more often read than the far more valuable *De Oratore*, which interests boys, if the whole is not read. The only poet in the *Prima* is Horace, nearly all the *Odes* being read, though of course a good teacher does not take them in Horace's order, but arranges them according to their contents. This is the first introduction to lyric metres. Sophocles is taken at the same time as Horace. The Prussian Scheme protests against the excessive learning by heart of the *Odes* of Horace and other Latin poetry and prose: "the greatest care must be taken in the selection of the passages." When the teacher knows how to inspire his class with a love of Horace, they will learn the finest *Odes* of their own accord. Of the *Satires* those which contain nothing offensive are read, together with some of the *Epistles*. The *Ars Poetica* is very popular because of its constant applicability to Greek and German reading.

The question has often been raised, whether other Latin poets should not be included in the school course of reading. A negative answer is generally given, though nearly always on merely practical grounds, such as the want of time. But the constant appearance of Anthologies from the Roman poets—of quite recent years I mention those of Schulze, H. Bender, etc.,—shows that an effort is being made to widen the circle of reading, and indeed that its boundaries are often passed. But no one, as far as I know, has cared to avail himself of the permission given in the Alsace-Lorraine Scheme, to read selected works of the Roman Comic poets as cursory reading in the upper classes: and this is well, for neither Terence nor Plautus is wholesome and fitting fare for school-boys. The mention of 'cursory' reading suggests another disputed point of paedagogics, that of the distinction between cursory and careful (*statarisch*) reading. Rapidity in reading is being more and more aimed at, where the subject admits of it, in order to introduce the pupils to a wider range of literature and enable them to view the greater masterpieces as wholes. Of course the teacher must be on his guard against superficiality of treatment.

I must here mention a point of some importance, the editions of the classics in use. The commonest, because the cheapest, are Teubner's Texts. At many schools the use of annotated books is allowed, and especially the editions with German notes which Teubner and Weidmann are publishing; but many other firms have lately entered the lists with success, *e. g.* Perthes at Gotha, Schoeningk at Paderborn, and others. Complaints are often made against the use of these commentaries in class, and it seems to me that they are justified. Firstly it gives the rich boy an advantage over the poor before the eyes of the whole class: then, from the teacher's point of view, it is open to this objection, that the idler boys rely on the notes which they do not read till they come to the class, and therefore do not listen to what the teacher is saying. On the other hand the use of such commentaries in preparation of lessons at home will be encouraged and recommended by reasonable teachers. It is to be regretted that the book-market is overstocked with numberless very cheap and generally very bad translations of Greek and Latin authors. A prohibition of their use at home does no good as it cannot be enforced, so it is better to acknowledge the existence of the evil and to try to combat it. Perhaps the best plan would be to recommend the pupils to use good translations and so to drive out the bad ones: at the same time the teacher must point out how translations should be used, and prevent by a strict watchfulness the mechanical and wrong use, as far as he can. In connexion with home-work I might

speaking of private reading, but I had better postpone it till I have treated Greek; and besides, this letter is already long enough for you and your readers.

Now a word as to Latin in the *Real-gymnasias*. These institutions generally teach Latin but not Greek. There is however, a great difference between those in Württemberg and those in the rest of Germany. (In Alsace-Lorraine the *Real-gymnasias* were entirely abolished in 1883 for no perceptible reason; their restoration is merely a question of time.) The *Real-gymnasium* in Württemberg is a direct development from the humanistic *Gymnasium*. There was an arrangement in the latter, by which certain pupils might be excused Greek and take English instead. Gradually the number of these "Barbarians," as they were called, grew large in the bigger towns, and they were formed into separate divisions, there being at last a division corresponding to each class. The obvious result was that these divisions were separated from the humanistic *Gymnasium* and made into independent schools with a programme of their own of "realistic" studies. This was the origin of the Stuttgart *Real-gymnasium*. Greek is not taught there, but Latin receives ninety-one hours a week, which is by fourteen a larger number of hours than is given to the subject in the Prussian humanistic *Gymnasias*, though it is eleven hours less than is given in those institutions in Württemberg. Consequently there is little difference in the teaching of Latin: indeed Horace and Tacitus are read as carefully as in the *Gymnasias*: but the requirements in the way of

composition are much smaller. In the rest of Germany it is different: the *Real-gymnasias* there originated in the old non-Latin *Real-Schulen*. Gradually it became customary to make a knowledge of Latin a qualification for the Government Service, and the *Real-Schulen* were forced to put Latin into their programme: the larger schools at any rate agreed to this arrangement, and the Education Scheme of 1859 appoints that in these schools forty-four weekly hours of Latin be obligatory. But this number of hours proving too small to live, too large to die, the Scheme of 1882 raised the number to fifty-four. The aim of this teaching in the *Real-gymnasias* is stated as follows: "Sound knowledge of the accidence and chief rules of Syntax and acquaintance with the more important rules of metre: the attainment of a vocabulary sufficient for the school course of reading. The reading of a selection of the works of classical literature, suited to the standard of each class." The authors named are Caesar, Sallust, Livy and Cicero (the easier speeches), and a selection from Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, Vergil's *Æneid* and the lyric poets. Whether it is possible to attain these ends with the higher number of hours, it is impossible to say with certainty as the regulation has only been in force five years. I shall come back to these institutions when I speak of the general aim and object of classical education.

DR. THEOBALD ZIEGLER,

Professor at the University of Strassburg.

ARCHAEOLOGY.

BRITISH MUSEUM.—During the year 1887 the Department of Coins and Medals in the British Museum has acquired 176 Greek and 30 Roman coins. Of these 11 are in gold, 83 in silver, 86 in bronze, and 26 in billon. An account of the most important acquisitions in the Greek class will be published by Mr. Warwick Wroth in Part I. of the *Numismatic Chronicle* for 1888.

FIND OF ROMAN COINS AT SPRINGHEAD.—A hoard consisting of 114 coins, extending from Gordian III. to Tetricus II., has recently been discovered at Springhead, near Gravesend. The coins, which are now the property of Mr. G. M. Arnold, of Milton Hall, near Gravesend, are chiefly of billon, and many of them are in good preservation. Mr. C. Roach Smith, who has just given a detailed notice of the hoard in the *Numismatic Chronicle* (1887, p. 312 f.), points out that, like many other hoards, it was probably buried at the time when Tetricus was gathering his troops in Britain before passing over to Gaul to oppose the Emperor Aurelian.

SALE OF SELECT GREEK COINS (Sotheby's, 27 June-1 July, 1887).—The editors of the *Numismatic Chronicle* (1887, p. 347) call special attention to this extraordinary sale, at which a large number of forgeries of rare and unique coins were catalogued and offered for purchase without any direct indication that they were false. It is not suggested that the owner sold the specimens knowing them to be false, but it is obvious that, though he describes himself as a 'zealous and hereditary amateur,' he has been grievously imposed upon during many years. Many of the forgeries had been manufactured from rare originals in the British Museum. It is therefore highly desirable that electrotypes or other copies of the Museum *rariora* should in future be supplied to the public with the greatest caution.

ATHENS.—Between the east end of the Parthenon and the Acropolis Museum a site is being excavated which has yielded fragments of statues in porous stone of great interest. According to the *Daily News* of Feb. 20, a large head of a male statue was discovered on the 18th which exhibits traces of brilliant colouring; it 'is believed to be the head of a Triton and to belong to a serpent-like body ending in the tail of a fish discovered a few days ago.' The impression is that these latest discoveries are earlier than the pre-Persian statues found last year, and are in fact the earliest examples of Athenian sculpture yet known. C. S.

CHESTER.—In the *Athenæum* of Feb. 11 an illustration is given of a curious stone relief with two figures, found at Chester. It appears to be Roman, but the subject is not distinct. C. S.

CYPRUS.—In the *Academy*, Feb. 11, Mr. Sayce writes of this island that, from an excavator's point of view, it is disappointing. He thinks the most promising site for tomb-excavations is Paraskevi, near Nikosia; a Babylonian cylinder with two lines of cuneiform character was recently found in a tomb there. 'The pottery of Paraskevi is for the most part pre-Phoenician, some of it being incised, and the lines filled with white; some of it again being ornamented with reliefs, which frequently assume the figure of a snake. In one instance I observed the figures of deer delineated in precisely the same way as on cylinders of the "Kypriote" class.'

He further mentions excavations undertaken at Kurion by the Vicomte de Castillon, the French Consul at Larnaka, on behalf of the Louvre, in order to test General Cesnola's account of his discovery of a temple treasure there. Among the objects found by him is a beautiful Hellenic vase of the best epoch,

with the words *Μεγαλῆς καλῆς* scratched (*sic*!) upon it. Within it was placed a second vase, and in this a bronze helmet. Many articles of gold were found at the same time, as well as specimens of Phoenician glass. Among the jewellery is a gold ring, the *chaton* of which has been engraved by Phoenician artists with the representation of a ship. The bow and stern of the ship terminate in the head of Anubis, and upon the deck are figures in a semi-Egyptian style, one of them being that of a seated deity.

M. Pottier informs me that no details of M. de Castillon's find have yet reached the Louvre.

Mr. E. Gardner is digging on the site of a Phoenician fortress at Liodari, near Nikosia.

The excavations of the Hellenic Society in Cyprus have resulted in some interesting discoveries on the site of the Temple of Aphrodite at Paphos. Several important inscriptions have been found. C. S.

EGYPT.—In the *Academy*, Feb. 18, Mr. Sayce writes of a twelve days' journey recently performed by him overland from Jerusalem to Kantara.

He thinks that Lachish is not to be identified with the site known as 'Umm Lakis, but that on the other hand Khan Yunes probably = Ienysos, where the buildings contain fragments of Roman marble and columns. Near the Egyptian frontier (ancient Raphia) is a mound strewn with pottery, marking the site of the ancient town, and four Roman columns, besides a Corinthian capital of white marble. At El 'Arish (ancient Rhinokoloura) are Ptolemaic remains, and six chambers of the house of some Roman functionary, who was a Christian, have just been found.

At Qes, on the sea-coast, is a hill with ruins, which Mr. Sayce identifies as the temple of Phoenician Zeus upon Mount Kasios. Pelusium promises well for excavation; the Roman pottery and glass with which the large mounds are covered have not been disturbed for centuries. About 200 cuneiform tablets have been recently sold in Cairo, which are said to come from Tell-el-Amarna.

The inscription from Cairo noted in the *Proceedings of the Soc. of Bibl. Arch.* (see *Summaries*) is as follows:

Εὐφύχει Κυρίλλα θεοῖς ἐναλίγκιε μορφῇ.
Νῦν γὰρ χῶρον ἔχεις ἡσυχον ἀδανάτων.
Ἔτος κβ.

The letters are of late imperial times. C. S.

SALISBURY.—In the *Standard* of Feb. 12 is a letter from a Mr. Nicholls stating that some workmen excavating in the garden of his house at Salisbury during the preceding week found a large Roman pavement. From his description the subject of this mosaic is evidently that of the battle of Issos, as represented in the well-known mosaic at Naples, and the newly-found specimen probably was a copy made early in the century for the decoration of the Salisbury garden. C. S.

THEBES.—The excavations on the site of the temple of the Kabeiroi (see *Classical Review*, 2, p. 54), are making good progress. The walls of the temple can now be traced, and two altars and a door have come to light, besides the fragments of several columns. A trench has been also found with the bones of animals which had been sacrificed. Among the minor objects are a great quantity of votive offerings, consisting principally of representations of oxen sacred to the Kabeiroi, some of them bearing inscriptions; 500 are in terra-cotta, 74 in bronze, 1 in bronze gilt, 83 in lead. Also there is the fragment of a b. f. vase with a bearded figure, over whom is inscribed *Κάβειρος*.

The occurrence of this large number of terra-cotta oxen reminds me that we have in the British Museum a large collection of terra-cotta oxen, which were found in 1883 by Mr. Biliotti in the district of Samsoun under circumstances of great interest. This site, however, was probably that of a temple of Apollo, worshipped under one of his many attributes as protector of herds—Epimelios, Nomios, Poimnios, &c. I propose to give a short description of this find in the next issue. CECIL SMITH.

Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique. December 1887. Athens and Paris.

1. Paris: excavations at the temple of Athena Crania: outside the ruins was found a large series of broken objects (*favissa*!), principally terra-cottas of various fabrics, of which he gives lists under Figures of Athena, Divinities, Comic figures, &c., combating Pottier's view as to the destination of figurines: three plates. 2. Radet: seventy three Greek inscriptions from Lydia. 3. Fougères: report of three months' excavations at Mantinea: he has worked upon the sites of the theatre, two temples, two colonnades, the agora and several minor buildings: lists of Sculptures, Inscriptions and minor objects. C. S.

Archäologisches Jahrbuch. Part iv. 1887. Berlin.

1. Böhlau: a Melian amphora at Athens: plate. 2. Winter: on the canon of proportions in early Attic art: as for vase-painting, so for sculpture a new epoch started at Athens during the Peisistratid period: two plates, several cuts, and a table. 3. von Duhn: three lekythi with representations of Charon. 4. Robert: notes on the interpretation of the Telephos frieze from Pergamon: an arrangement and explanation of the fragments which are now grouped (first art., seven cuts). 5. Gercke: Apollo as conqueror of the Gauls: the Stroganoff bronze, whatever the hand holds, cannot be cited for restoration of the Apollo Belvedere. 6. Koepf: the weapons of the Giants at different stages of art. 7. Kuhner: a vase picture published in *Jahrb.* i. pl. 10, 2, is not Pelus and Thetis, but the Leukippidae. 8. Loeschcke: Archaic vase at Corneto with Niobide scene. 9. Studniczka: notes and addenda to his article, p. 135. C. S.

Antike Denkmäler. (See *C.R.* I., p. 250). Band 1: zweites Heft. Berlin. 1888.

Pl. 13-17. Senz: architectural plans of the tomb of the Julii at St. Remy (Provence). 18. Borrmann: three early Ionic capitals from the recent discoveries on the Akropolis at Athens. 19. Petersen and Wolters: coloured plate of two female statues, also from these discoveries. 20. Helbig: the Etruscan sarcophagus recently acquired by the British Museum, with woodcuts of the tomb furniture (see *C.R.* I. p. 118). 21. Dümmler: bronze strips of repoussé work, from Bomarzo: he thinks they are not of Etruscan origin. 22. Amphora b.f. with Niobide scene. 23. Three Lekythi with Charon scenes. 24. Second wall painting from the Villa of Livia (see pl. 11). C. S.

Gazette Archéologique. Nos. 11-12. 1887. Paris.

1. De Villefosse: bronze amphora handle with archaic anguiped Gorgon, in the Louvre: plate. 2. Martha: a terra-cotta Siren from Vulci, of the fifth century B.C. (plate). 3. Reinach: the draped Venus in the Louvre (continued), a study of the works of Praxiteles and of their imitations. 7. Froehner: terra-cotta group, representing the 'marriage of Pan': one of the so-called Asia Minor series: plate. 8. Flouest and Bazin: letters relating to the Gaulish god of the hammer: two cuts. C. S.

Gazette des Beaux Arts. Feb. 1888.

1. Reinach: the Venus of Knidos: among other illustrations he gives a photograph of the Vatican Venus freed from her tin trousers, and compares it with the Glyptothek Venus. In the Vatican statue the vase is turned round, i.e. she lays aside her drapery with the wrong hand, if we accept the coins: probably the coin graver was in error; the terra-cotta replicas are 7:3 in favour of statue. Lastly as to date; on evidence of age of Phryne (who could not have been more than 30 when she posed for this type), he puts it at 350-345.

5. Darcel: reviews Fontenay's article '*La Technique de la Bijouterie Ancienne*', the interest of which is that it is written by a goldsmith (first art.).

C. S.

Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology. vol. x. pt. 3. London. 1888.

1. Piehl: Greek inscription found in Egypt. 2. Houghton: the Pistie Nard of the Greek Testament: he makes *πάρουβος* a form borrowed from Sanskrit *pisitā* (= *Nardostachys Jatamansi*), the root of which was the costly ingredient of the ointment. 4. Max Müller: notes on the 'Peoples of the Sea' of Merenptah: he holds that the Shardin were inhabitants of islands in the Tuscan Sea, confuting Brugsch's idea of the Colchi-Caucasian origin by a reference to the custom of circumcision.

C. S.

Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of London. vol. xi. no. 4. London. 1887.

P. 396. The President exhibited an onyx cameo $3\frac{1}{4}$ in. by $2\frac{1}{4}$ in. with head of Medusa, found in Rome: he considers it must have ornamented the aegis of a statue of imperial times: the style he attributes to the Rhodian School: (photographic plate).

C. S.

The Asiatic Quarterly Review. January, 1888. London.

5. 'The Gnostics,' by Captain Conder: a study as to 'the true meaning and tendency of Gnostic teaching, treating the question comparatively with the aid of monuments and of Oriental literature.'

11. 'The empire of the Hittites in the History of Art,' by Sir G. Birdwood: tracing the history of the Hittites, their remains, as at present known, in literature and art, and referring to them 'the primitive

impulse to the artistic life and activity of the Old World,' rather than to the Greeks or Phoenicians.

C. S.

The Athenaeum of Feb. 4, gives an account by Prof. Lanciani of recent events in Rome: the archaeology has mostly been noted in the summaries of the *Bullettino Comunale*.

C. S.

Builder.

Jan. 28. Excavations at Thespieae, and at Athens.

Feb. 4. Excavations at Mantinea.

Feb. 18. The terra-cottas of Elateia, the excavations at Thespieae. Brunn's Denkmäler.

Archaeological Journal, no. 176:—(pp. 311-321) *Valentia Segellaunorum*, by E. A. Freeman.—(pp. 322-336) *Roman Villa at Chedworth*, by G. E. Fox, with plans.—(pp. 351-364) *Roman Britain*, by H. M. Scarth. Mr. Scarth criticizes the chapter in Mommsen's new volume: his criticisms are, however, of no great value.—(pp. 375-379) *Roman Forces in Britain*, by W. T. Watkin, supplement to a former article.—(pp. 380-396) *Celtic and Roman Antiquities in Dorset*, by W. Smart.

Numismatic Chronicle, 3rd series, vol. vii. part iv. (1887).

B. V. Head:—*Electrum coins and their specific gravity*. Part I. of this important paper contains a detailed description of the numerous electrum coins acquired by the British Museum, chiefly during the last twelve years. Part II. gives a valuable list of the specific gravities of numerous electrum pieces weighed by Mr. Head. From these specific gravities the proportions of gold and silver in the electrum coins can be approximately determined; not however with absolute accuracy, as analysis has shown that some specimens contain also a third metal, namely copper. The colour of the specimens is found by Mr. Head to be a fairly good test of the quality. The dark or rich yellow pieces are found by him to contain from 72 to 55 per cent. of gold; the yellow, 68 to 36 per cent.; the very pale yellow sometimes as little as 14, 10 or 5 per cent.

Admiral T. Spratt:—*Note on three gold coins from Crete*. Three examples, probably found at Polyphrenium, of a curious class of very thin gold Cretan coins, having on one side the type of an eagle.

No other gold coins of Crete are known.

C. Roach Smith:—*Discovery of a Hoard of Roman Coins at Springhead*.

W. WROTH.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

Athenaeum: 21 Jan. 1888; notices of Holden's 'Cyropaedela' and Ramsay's 'Selections from Tibullus and Propertius.'—28 Jan. review of Bowen's 'Virgil in English Verse.'—11 Feb. review of Greenwell's 'The Electrum Coinage of Cyzicus.'—18 Feb. review of M. Müller's 'Biographies of Words.'

Academy: 21 Jan. 1888; review by Rob. Ellis of Haskins' 'Lucan.'—28 Jan. review by E. D. A. Morshead of Bowen's 'Virgil in English Verse.'—4 Feb. A. L. Mayhew writes on the etymology of *Fors*, connecting it with *fero*, against Max Müller (the discussion continues, with some asperity, in the two following numbers); Dr. Wilkins reviews R. S. Conway's 'Verner's law in Italy'; G. A. Simcox writes on Bp. Chr. Wordsworth's emendation of Lucan, *Phars.* 9, 567 (continued).—18 Feb. R. F. Littledale reviews Smith and Wace's 'Dict. of Christian Biography'; communication from J. Cook Wilson against some emendations of Dr. Jackson's in the 'Ethics.'

The *Contemporary Review* for February has an article by Gladstone on 'The Homeric Herē,' and *Macmillan's Magazine* an article by J. W. Mackail on 'Virgil in English Verse.'

Rheinisches Museum, vol. xlii. part 4, contains:—

A. Kalkmann, *Tatian's Nachrichten über Kunstwerke*. 'The works of art mentioned by Tatian 33-5 are mostly fictions.'—L. Mendelssohn, *De Zosimi acate disputatio*. Reasons for fixing date between 450 and 501 A.D. and not in first half of century as Jeep (*Rh. M.* xxxvii. 425).—A. Otto, *Zur Kritik von Statius Silvae*, II. (continued from vol. xlii. 373). Notes and emendations on Bks. II.-V. A. Ludwig, *Der Homerische Hymnus auf Pan*. Places ll. 8-11 after l. 29 and 37, 40, 39, 38, 41 in this order, with some changes of reading.—B. Niese, *Straboniana*. VI. *Die Erwerbung der Küsten des Pontus durch Mithridates VI.* A sketch

of the origin and progress of M.'s conquests on the Euxine by comparison of Strabo and the Diophantus inscr. (Ditt. Syll. I. 371). VII. *Die letzten Tyrannen Athens* Athenio, mentioned by Posidonius (Athen. v. 211. E.) is distinct from Aristio mentioned Paus. I. 20. 5, App. *Mithr.* 28ff.—F. Bücheler, *Alles Latein* (continued from xxxix. 427.) Derives barge from *βάρης* (*barica*), and so on from *sonium*, *senium*, distinct from *senium* = *senectus*, giving traces of its existence.—A. Gercke, *Alexandrinische Studien* (continued from xlii. 275). On the relations between Callimachus and Theocritus with the chronology of their lives: from internal evidence.—X. *Ein Brief Philip Buttmanns*.

Miscellen. —

A. Ludwig, *Zu Kolluthos und Nomos*. Denying for these poets existence of plural of *πρόσωπον* and emending accordingly.—K. Schumacher, *Πιστή und Κύλαρος*. *Zu Livius*, xxxiii. 18. The light thrown on this passage by an inscr. (*Bull. Corr. Hell.* viii. 358).—C. Weyman, *Martialis und Alcinus Avitus*.—J. Werner, *Zu des Aegyptiaci*.—G. Mollat, *Mehrere unbekannte Incunabeln*.

The same. xliii. 1. contains:—

K. Lugebil, *Zur Frage über die Accentuation der Wörter und Wortformen im Griechischen*. 'The Alexandrian tradition is not to be relied on, unless supported by comparative evidence' (to be continued).—C. Wachsmuth, *Zu Statius Silven*, i. 6, l. 94, *inemptas* sc. *quae emi non possent*. After l. 77 is probably omitted a line like '*quas Ganges lavat ac pelus Scytharum*.'—Th. Kock, *Lucian und die Komödie*. Traces of comic influence on his writings. In his Timon the expressions, in his Dial. Meretr. the substance, largely from this source.—A. Jeep, *Die Verlorenen Bücher des Ammianus*. Against Michael's theory that our Ammianus contains parts of two works.—H. van Heerwerden, *Ad hynnum in Mercurium*. Notes and emendations on Gemoll's (Ternbner) text.—J. Bruns, *Lucian's philosophische Satiren*. I. 'The Vitarum Auctio and Piscator are complementary of each other.'—J. Beloch, *Zur Finanzgeschichte Athens*. vii. 8 *ἐν Ἀπιαρείου φόρος*, against Kirchhoff's view that Thuc. i. 46 is incorrect. viii. *Das psephisma des Kallias*. 'Boeckh's date (419/8 B.C.) for C.I.A. i. 32, is correct and not Kirchhoff's (435/4 B.C.).'—C. Frick, *J. J. Scaliger und die Excerpta Latina Barbari*.—F. Bücheler, *Weihnachtschriften von Capua*. Two Oscan votive tablets: facsimiles with commentary.—F. Marx, *De aetate Lueretii*. 'Birth 96 B.C., death 54 B.C.'

Miscellen. —

J. Toepffer, *Thargelingebräuche*. On human sacrifices.—J. E. Kirchner, *Zum Gesetz von Gortyn*.—H. U., *Alterthümliche Verse*. An Attic inscr. (6th. cent.) in tetrameters with four irregular accents.—H. U., *Anaximenes auch Dichter*. 'He is referred to beside Choerilus on a Herculean papyrus and so probably also wrote an Alexandrine epos.'—F. B., *Der Philosoph Nikasikrates*.—G. Heidtmann, *Terentius Adelph.* 191–249. Arranges the lines in the following order: 200, 206, 207, 202–4, 208, excising 201 and 205.—E. Hoffmann, *Zu Caesar de bell. civ. I. 25*. Transposes *Has quatenus...moverentur* and *Has terra...impediretur*.—J. Klein, *M. Asinius Sabini*. 'The same in *Bull. Corr. Hell.* xi. 97 as in C.I.L. vi. 1067.'

Philologus, vol. xlv. part 3 contains:—

I. *Abhandlungen*. XV. J. Bachmann, *Lateinische Secundus-handschriften* (aus der Egl. bibliothek zu München).—XVI. P. Langen, *Bemerkungen über die beobachtung des Wortaccentes im älteren lateinischen drama*. 'Assuming influence of word-accent best explains divergence from Greek originals in (1) avoiding two short syllables in arsis; (2) observing caesura

in third foot.' Against Wilh. Meyer in *Abhandl. k. Bayer. Acad.* I. 17, 1.—XVII. A. Scotland, *Kritische untersuchungen zur Odyssee*. 'The object of Telemachus' journey is to obtain the certainty of Odysseus' death and hence reject α 195–205, 234–240, 267–278, 293–302, β 131 *πατήρ*—132 *τέθηκε*.'—XVIII. Max Hecht, *Zu Aristarchs erklärungen homerischer wortbedeutungen*. Connect *λευγαίος* with *λυγρός*, not with *λογός*, and translate 'pitiful': *φόβος*, *φοβέω*, &c. can mean 'fear' as well as 'flight'.—XIX. Fr. Hanssen, *Zur kritik der Pseudoanakkreonta*. 'Nos. 21–32 are by the Pseudophokylides († Aristobulus).' Discusses metre of No. 4.—XX. A. Baur, *Der herausgeber des Thukydides*. Against the 'editor' theory.

II. *Jahresberichte*. I. Herbst, *Thukydides*. This fourth article reviews the following dissertations:—G. F. Unger, *Das kriegsjahr des Thukydides* (*Philologus* xliii. 577).—U. de Wilamowitz-Möllendorf, *Curae Thukydideae* (*Index Scholl. Göttingen* 1885).—Id. *Thukydideische daten* (*Hermes* 20, 477).—J. H. Lipsius, *Zu Thukydides II., 2.* (*Leipziger Studien* 8, 161).—H. Müller-Strübing, *Das erste jahr des peloponnesischen krieges* (*Neue Jahrb.* 1883, pp. 578 and 657).

III. *Miscellen*. A., *Auszüge aus schriften*, &c. Summaries of *Rev. Critique*, no. 27, *Amer. Journ. Phil.* nos. 23, 24. *Academy*, July, August, September, *Anz. für schweizeralterthumskunde*, no. 3.

Short Notes. M. Petschenig, *Zu Seneca, De Ira*, II. 9, 2. Reads *miscendum coacti sunt*. II. 11, 2, *addici velim*.—II. 21, 5, *ne angustum patiamur*, III. 2, 4, *patribus <in> publicum exitum*.—III. 5, 4, *ira impendit pro quis grassata est*.—III. 18, 4, *quam ingenua crudelitas*. *De tranq. anim.* 3, 3, *insinuat...cursim pro quis grassata est*.—*Ad Marciam* II. 3, *haerentis, quem fatum repentinum claudit <et> ex improviso*. 18, 2, *hincque aequali axe dividendum*.—A. Eussner, *Zu Tacitus Hist.* II. 4, 19. Read *integra quies et inexpectum belli*.—*Hist.* III. 18, 1, *forte victi* is a gloss on *ubi fortuna contra fuit*.

Archiv für lateinische Lexicographie, iv. 3, 4. 1887.

Essen u. Trinken im Sprichwort (A. Otto). A valuable collection of proverbs, but *naviget Anticyram*, &c. should not be omitted when hellebore is included. Cp. *Archiv*, iii. 59, 207, 388; iv. 19.—*Instar*. (E. W.) Fresh proof that *instar* is infinitive *instare*, *Archiv*, ii. 597.—*Uls, trans, ultra* (Ph. Thielmann), conclusion. *Ullageris* (J. N. Ott) 'from olla, = *ullā-ēris*, ep. *Archiv*, iii. 176.—*Penes* (P. Hirt) discussed lexicographically with explanations.—*Substantiva mit in privation* (E. W.) 'Rare in archaic, almost absent in good Latin; common only in African writers.'—*Mulus mulaster* (E. W.)—*Velum* = *Fahrzeug, Floss* (H. Pfannenschmid). 'The French of 1500 A.D. contains a word *walle voile* = river-raft; this comes from Latin *velum* (= *vehiculum*) distinct from *velum* 'sail' (= **ves-lum*, cf. *vestis*).—*Impensae, mōrtel* (O. Seeck) In Salvin de gubern. dei iii. 1, 1.—*Vulgarlateinische substrata* (G. Gröber)—Words beginning with O—*Viscera = membra* (W. Brandes).—*Aderbia auf -iter* (H. Osthoff). 'These are compounded with *iter*, a journey; *breviter* = kurzweg, *simpliciter* = schlechweg, &c. The suffix was then extended by analogy, But *praeiter propter inter* are "rein komparativisch."—*Abco* (J. Menrad), *abicio, abiectus, abicte* (Ph. Thielmann), *ablatio, abluo* &c. to *abundo* (E. W.) lexicographical articles.—*Nature* (J. E. B. Mayor) correcting Madvig's *nature Advers.* ii. 82.—*Subitare* (E. W.) *Miscellen*: among these are *Verbalformen vom Perfektstamme bei Claudian* (Birt), *scēsis sētius* (A. Zimmermann) *Firmicus Maternus* (K. Sittl) *ut quid and prorsus ut* (E. W.), *sacculum* and *saccula* (H. Nettle-

ship). The latter argues that *saccula* cannot = 'spirit as the age,' as *sacculum* does, in good Latin. Hence he explains otherwise Lucan x. 109, and Prop. ii. 25, 35, and shows the lateness of the Epicedion Drusi (line 45).

Zeitschrift für das Gymnasial-Wesen. The December number contains only one article of general interest. This is a systematic collection of examples of 'Kakophonien' from Cicero and Horace, with a few from other writers. Judgment in such matters is largely, as Prof. Kraffert says, subjective: but many of his instances are undeniable. The conclusion which he draws is that a disagreeable sound is not a sufficient reason for attempting emendations even in the most careful of classical authors.

Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift. April—December, 1887:—

April 16. H. Jordan, *Der Tempel der Vesta u. das Haus der Vestalinnen* (O. Richter). 'Dissenting from Lanciani, offers a new but not altogether tenable reconstruction of the temple. Fixes date of atrium to reign of Hadrian. An exhaustive work.'—K. Brugmann, *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indog. Sprachen* (O. Bremer). 'Admirably trustworthy, always distinguishing the certain from the probable.' 23rd. Fick, *Die homerische Ilias, &c.* (P. Cauer), 1st notice. H. Paul, *Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte* (H. Ziemer). 'This, the 2nd edition much enlarged from the 1st, improved both in matter and form. Useful and suggestive. Illustrations from German specially full.' 30th. A. Fick, *Die homerische Ilias nach ihrer Entwicklung betrachtet u. in der ursprünglichen Sprachform wiedergestellt* (P. Cauer). 2nd notice: 'Theory not proven. Law that Aeolism survives only where metre or lack of a word prevents Ionic, does not hold good. Aeolic element, however large now or once, better explained as due to mingling of dialects.'—P. Gardner, *Catalogue of Indian coins in Brit. Mus.* (H. Weil). 'Coins of Greek and Scythic Kings of Bactria and India carefully discussed. Hellenic, semihellenic, and Indian elements in the types ably distinguished.'—W. Wroth, *Catalogue of Greek coins in Brit. Mus.* (id.) 'Coins of Crete and Aegean isles treated. Several original assignments proposed.'

June 18. V. Rose, *Aristotelis quae ferebantur librorum fragmenta* (M. Wallies). 'A useful handbook. Excludes many fragments held genuine by other scholars.'—F. Schoell, *Plauti Captivi*, for Ritschl's edition (O. Seyffert), 1st notice. 'Original emendations, in text or appendix, many; few convincing.'—K. Krumbacher, *Ein irrationaler Spirant im Griechischen* (Wäschke). 'Theory of a spirant γ leads to a new triple classification of Greek dialects, i.e. of the mainland, of the Cyclades, and of the Sporades.'

July 16. J. E. Sandys, *M. Tulli Ciceronis ad M. Brutum Orator* (E. Heerdegen). 'Introduction, in nine sections, combines sound learning with grace of style: many known facts presented in new lights and connexions. Exegetical notes clear and good, if sometimes to a German reader too full. Apparatus criticus might be lightened without loss. Text occasionally retains vulgate uncritically.'—F. B. Jevons, *A History of Greek Literature to Death of Demosthenes*. (H. Müller). 'Popular. Influence of political and social facts in literature well stated. Arrangement faulty. Criticism often arbitrary.' 23rd. W. S. Tyler, *The Iliad of Homer* (R. Peppermüller). 'Il. 16–24 edited for students. Uncritical.'—A. Sloman, *P. Terenti Adelphi* (A. G. Engelbrecht). 'Notes adapted to beginners; according to German standard, often superfluous and trivial.'—Unger, *Zeitrechnung der Griechen u. Römer*: review continued from last week: (A. Mommsen). 'In spite of its general merits has several serious defects.'

August 6. Sitzler, *Die Lyriker Eunuchus, Terpan-*

der, u. Alkman in ihrem Verhältnis zu Homer. 'After discussing the dialect of the three poets, endeavours, by annotation, to illustrate the linguistic influence asserted.'—R. Maffei, *Le favole Atellanæ*. 'Maintains, against Mommsen, the Oscan origin of the Atellanæ, which, however, he thinks were Latinized in Latium.'—A. Müller, *Lehrbuch der Griechischen Bühnenaltertümer* (G. Oehmichen). 'A most useful and meritorious book. A mass of materials collected and applied with caution and effect.' 20th. H. Selling, *Ursprung u. Messung des Homerischen Verses* (A. Ludwig). 'A novel, but baseless theory.'—Herwerden, *Lucubrations Sophocleae*. 'His conjectures always ingenious; some merit permanent attention.' 27th. A. von Gutschmid, *Ueber die syrische Epitome des Eusebianischen Canones* (C. Frick). 'A careful and learned contribution to the subject; a valuable revision of the critical questions involved.'—C. H. Keene, *The Eclogues of Calpurnius Siculus and M. Aurelius Olympius Nemesianus* (R. Ehwald). 'First English edition, good use made of work of precursors, especially M. Haupt: formation of text neither consistent nor well-grounded.'

Sept. 3. Barthold, *Euripidis Medea* (Wecklein). 'A careful edition, several good, but many very arbitrary conjectures.'—Tyrrell, *The Correspondence of M. Tullius Cicero* (Gurlitt). 'A boon to students: notes, introductions, and arrangement clear and able: textual work of only provisional value pending a final classification, &c. of MSS: but editor should not have neglected the cod. Bodleianus.'—Baumeister, *Denkmäler des Klassischen Altertums*. 'In spite of not a few defects and inequalities, a most useful book of reference.' 10th. J. Karabacek, *Mitteilungen aus der Sammlung des Papyrus Erzherzog Rainer* (A. Mommsen). 'Six large and several smaller excerpts.'—17th. G. G. Ramsay, *Selections from Tibullus and Propertius* (Otto). 'Ample introductions on biography and text: notes careful and accurate, if rather too lengthy: textual work lacks consistency: German special literature not neglected.' Pearson and Strong, *Thirteen Satires of Juvenal* (Friedländer). 'Poet.' 24th. J. v. Leeuwen, jr. u. M. B. Mendes da Costa, *Der Dialekt der homerischen Gedichte* (P. Cauer). 'Intended for use in schools, but not well adapted to that or any end.'—G. Thilo, *P. Vergili Maronis Carmina* (Güthling). 'A useful contribution to conservative criticism of the text of Vergil:—with a lucid introduction de vita carminibusque V.'

Oct. 1. C. Simmons, *P. Ovidii Nasonis metamorphoseon xiii, xiv* (R. Ehwald). 'Commentary learned and good: critical work of editor indifferent: but appended notes by R. Ellis valuable, especially as regards the cod. Canon vii.'—E. Oberhummer, *Akarnanien, Ambrakia, Amphilochien, Leukas im Altertum* (R. Weil). 'A useful and elaborate monograph.' 8th. Th. Saarmann *De Oenomaos Gadareno* (Wendland). 'A welcome monograph on the fragments.'—H. Berkh, *De Geoponicorum codd. manuscriptis* (Gemoll). 'Preliminary to an edition which promises to be valuable.'—E. Windisch, *Georg Curtius, Eine Charakteristik*. 'Interesting.' 15th. J. Adam, *Platonis Apologia Socratis* (O. Apelt). 'Excellent, both in introduction and notes: in text scarcely enough weight is allowed to cod. T. and to Schanz's latest researches.'—C. Waddington, *Mémoire sur l'Authenticité des Ecrits de Platon*. 'Rebukes all the German critics, maintains full traditional canon, following Grote, and classes dialogues in two groups, an earlier and a later.' 22nd. E. A. Freeman, *The Chief Periods of European History: with an Essay on Greek Cities under Roman Rule* (H. Schiller). 'Contains little or nothing new: chapter on relations of Rome with the barbarians the best.' 29th. Th. Thälheim, *De Dinarchi codicibus commentatio et Dinarchi orationes iii.* (W. Grasshoff). 'New collation of the two chief codd. A and N (Oxon): N not always

right in cases of discrepancy, but A as often: both form one archetype. Edition careful and best yet made.'—Tycho Mommsen, *Beiträge zur Lehre von den griechischen Präpositionen* (G. Vogrinz). 'First part of what promises to be a most instructive history of Greek syntax.'—O. Brugmann, *über den Gebrauch des Konditionalen in der älteren Latinität*. 'Valuable and suggestive.'

Nov. 5. K. Joël, *Zur Erkenntnis der geistigen Entwicklung u. der schriftstellerischen Motive Platos* (K. Troost). 'Gives several good arguments for the view which sees a natural development of theory in the successive dialogues.'—C. Biggs, *The Christian Platonists of Alexandria*. 'The various German authorities thoroughly used. Study of Origen shews special care and learning.' 12th. A. W. Verrall, *Alcibiades ἐπὶ τῷ ἠθῶς* (H. Müller). 'Introduction traces development of plot, &c.: in text defends choric passages often held corrupt: conjectures usually cautious and sensible.'—E. H. Meyer, *Indogermanische Mythen* (Roscher), contin. in foll. week.—H. Achilleis: 'Important and wide-reaching: opinions the more worthy consideration because author views Homeric question from an independent standpoint: theory of Centaurs less probable than the rest.' 19th. Glazebrook, *Euripides' Medea*. 'Well adapted for use in schools.' C. B. Heberden *Euripides' Medea* (Wecklein). 'An intelligently prepared school-edition. Some bad conjectures admitted.' 26th. Haake, *Die Gesellschaftslehre* (P. Wendland). 'Develops the connexion of the social with the metaphysical doctrine of the Stoa.'—E. Wilisch, *Beiträge zur inneren Geschichte des alten Korinth* (S. Egelhaaf). 'Deserves the attention of all students of Grecian history.'

Dec. 3. C. Robert, *Archäologische Märchen aus aller u. neuer Zeit* (G. Oehmichen) concluded: 'Interpretation of data furthered directly and by suggestion.'—J. La Roche, *Homeri Ilias* (E-Θ) (P. Cauer). 'For schools: little altered from second edition.'—E. Wolff, *Taciti historiarum libri qui supersunt* (bks. i-ii) (A. Eussner). 'Satisfactory: introduction well written.' 10th. J. Ohse, *Zu Platons Charmides*. 'Seeks, after Teichmüller, criteria of genuineness of this and other dialogues.'—J. P. Mahaffy, *Alexander's Empire* (G. Egelhaaf). 'In spite of great defects, useful and instructive.'—H. J. Roby, *An Introduction to the Study of Justinian's Digest* (J. Baron). 'Personality and writings of the several jurists down to cent. 3, A.D. carefully treated: essay on juristic Latin contains much worth notice.'—Upcott, *Introduction to Greek Sculpture* (Braeckner). 'Well adapted, as intended, for beginners.' 17th. Max Duncker, *Abhandlungen aus der griechischen Geschichte* (G. Hertzberg): posthumous: 'Exhibit all the industry, synoptic power, and keen insight which distinguished the deceased historian.'—F. Holzweissig, *Griechische Syntax* (F. Müller). 'A valuable, well-arranged book.' 24th. G. Kaibel, *Athenaei deipnosophistarum libri xv.* (K. O.) vol. 2. 'Shows fine insight, judgment, mastery of Greek, and skill in correcting errors of MSS, among which the Marcianus has been collated conscientiously.'—Fr. Schöll, *Redens von Plautus* (O. Seyffert). 'In spite of much that is arbitrary, furthers the criticism of the text.'—H. Winkler, *Zur Sprachgeschichte*. 'A very interesting book, showing power and insight.'—G. Rawlinson, *Ancient Egypt*. 'Not badly written and illustrated, but of no independent value.'

Original article: Dec. 24. R. Meister, *Zu den Kyprischen Inschriften*.

Revue de Philologie, xi. 1: Jan.—Mar. 1887. H. Weil (*Les Posthomeriques Cycliques*) agrees with Wilamowitz in his *Homerische Untersuchungen* that the attributions of the *Cyclic poems* to authors are late and arbitrary, and that the *Ἰαῶς Πέποις* to which Pausanias refers as the work of *Αἰόχως* (so he spells

the name) is not, as usually supposed, identical with the Little Iliad of Lesches, but with the *Πέποις* of Arctinos; but he differs in holding that there were really two parallel *Cyclic poems* describing the sack of Troy, not one only. He suggests that the episode of Laocoon and the departure of Aeneas existed only in the *Πέποις*, not in the Little Iliad, that Welcker is wrong in regarding Ulysses as the hero of the Little Iliad, and that the Little Iliad was not a direct continuation of the Iliad but, like the *Πέποις*, of the *Αἰόχως*.—H. Weil emends or explains Apoll. Rhod. iii. 744 &c., Eur. *Alc.* 644 &c. In Od. xi. 489 he takes *ἐν ἀρούρης* 'on earth' not 'on a farm.'—A. Cartault infers that Silius Ital. began the *Punica* before 88 A.D., wrote Bk. iii. in 93, Bk. xiv. in 97 and xv.-xvii. between 97 and his death in 101; where therefore Silius and Statius are parallel, Silius is the imitator.—A. Cartault reads *et alia poemata* in a corrupt passage of Vacca's Life of Lucan and discusses the list of Lucan's works there given.—Ch. Cucuel argues that in the Alcestis there is nothing comic or satyric, nothing alien to the true spirit of tragedy. Discussing the views of Patin and Girardin he urges that the recriminations of Admetus and Pheres let us see the reason why Admetus has allowed his wife to die, the intense love of life which, perhaps only for a moment, has overcome him; Hercules is no comic character, though 'the Gargantua of Greek mythology'; he shows great delicacy of feeling, and even his boisterousness helps to bring out the joy of living which has been too strong for Admetus. All is true to nature though the later part of the play is pitched in a lower key than the earlier.—P. Girard in Dem. de Cor. 169 condemns τὰ γέρε' ἀνεμειγμένα as impossible; the *ἀγορά* would not be the place for a beacon-fire. He rejects Cobet's *περιμετάνυσται*, because the *ἐκκλησία* met in the *πύλῃ* not the *ἀγορά* and for other reasons. Referring to Schol. on Arist. *Acharn.* 22, he proposes τὰ γέρε' ἀνεμετάνυσται, 'placed barriers round the *ἀγορά*', that the people might not gather there but be driven to the *πύλῃ*.—L. Havet, *Propert.* iv. 11, 66, would read *Consule quo fausto tempore nuptia soror.*—P. Tannery, referring to three Paris MSS., classifies the Scholia on Aristarchus of Samos in three groups differing in age, emends and explains them in several places and resolves two MS. abbreviations into *ὁδὸ-μνημα* 'commentary' and *παρὰθίμενον* or *παράκειμενον* 'marginal note.'—Sp. Vassil shows by many quotations, against Riemann, that the infinitive of *scribere* is *scripturum fuisse* not *scripturum esse*.—C. Comte corrects *lucraris* (Commodian, i. 21, 5), into *lucrasti*, and shows that the piece is a double acrostich.—L. Havet (Terence, *Heaut.* 289) proposes *os expositum* for *esse expositum* and discusses *Phormio* 215 and *Adolphus* 610 sqq.—A. M. Desrousseaux proposes several emendations in Lucian, *Dial. Mort.* and *Gallus* and in Herodotus.—L. Havet regards a line and a half (*Aen.* vi. 438, 439) as a spurious insertion from *Georg.* iv. 479.—G. Bernardakis proposes several emendations in Plutarch.—E. Audouin would distinguish between the dative and abl. with *ab* with the gerundive thus: *illud mihi faciendum est*, 'c'est pour moi une obligation (nécessité) de faire cela'; *illud a me faciendum est*, 'il convient que cela soit fait par moi.'—L. Havet restores some anapaests of Ennius quoted by Macrobius, vi. 2, 25, and discusses the insertion or omission in Latin of prepositions with names of places.—A. Jacob emends a very corrupt subscription in *Par.* 290.—S. Reinach (Lucan, viii. 146) proposes *mor* for *non*.—L. Chatelain gives at length a collation of certain verses of the lost Remensia of Phaedrus made by Denys Roche in 1655 and judges the MS. to have been of high value.—M. Bonnet shows that the Montpellier MS. of Quintilian (Mp.) is a copy of the Berne MS. (Bn.) and quotes thence with approval a note of a sixteenth century corrector on x. 1, 15 deleting *Cicconem* as a gloss.

LIST OF NEW BOOKS.

ENGLISH BOOKS.

- Arrian*. Selections, edited for the use of schools by Rev. J. Bond and A. S. Walpole. With Notes, Vocabulary, and Exercises. 16mo. ix. 144 pp. London, Macmillan. 1s. 6d.
- Inge* (W. R.) *Society in Rome under the Caesars*. Crown 8vo. Murray. 6s.
- Old Latin Biblical Texts*: No. III. The Four Gospels from the Munich MS. (Q) now numbered Lat. 6224 in the Royal Library at Munich, with a fragment from St. John in the Hof-Bibliothek at Vienna (cod. lat. 502). Edited with the aid of Tischendorf's transcript (under the direction of the Bishop of Salisbury) by H. J. White, M.A. Small 4to. lv. 166 pp. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 12s. 6d.
- Plato*. The *Timaeus*, edited with Introduction and Notes by R. D. Archer-Hind, M.A. 8vo. viii. 358 pp. London, Macmillan. 16s.

- Polybius*. The Achaean League, edited with Introduction and Notes by Rev. W. W. Capes, M.A. Fcap. 8vo. xxxv. 418 pp. Macmillan. 6s.
- Select Passages from Greek and Latin Poets, with English metrical renderings, compiled by E. H. C. Smith, M.A. with a Preface by J. M. Wilson, M.A. Crown 8vo. viii. 128. Rivington. 3s. 6d.
- Virgil*. *Aeneidos* Lib. IX., edited for the use of schools by the Rev. H. M. Stephenson, with Notes and Vocabulary. 16mo. 88 pp. London, Macmillan. 1s. 6d.
- Welch* (W.) and *Duffield* (C. G.) *Latin Accidence and Exercises*, arranged for beginners. 16mo. x. 78 pp. London, Macmillan.
- Xenophon*. *Anabasis*. Book I., ch. i.-viii. For the use of beginners. With titles to the sections, Notes, Exercises, and Vocabulary, by E. E. Wells. 16mo. xii. 126 pp. London, Macmillan. 1s. 6d.

FOREIGN BOOKS.

- Aristotle*. *Commentaria in Aristotelem graeca*. Vol. VI., part II. *Asclepii in metaphysica commentaria*, ed. M. Hayduck. 8vo. Berlin, Reimer. 19 Mk.
- Berthelot* (A.) et *Didier*. *Histoire intérieure de Rome jusqu'à la Bataille d'Actium*. Tirée des Römische Alterthümer de Lange. 2 vols. 8vo. Paris. Leroux. 20 fcs.
- Birt* (Th.). *Zwei politische Satiren d. alten Rom*. 8vo. Marburg, Elwert. Mk. 2. 20.
- Brann* (H.). *Denkmäler griechischer und römischer Skulptur in historischer Anordnung*, herausgegeben von F. Bruckmann. Part I. 5 photographic plates in Imp. folio with Introductory text. Munich, F. Bruckmann. 20 Mk.
- Berlage* (J.) *Commentatio de Euripide philosopho*. 8vo. 214 pp. Leyden, J. Brill.
- Cucuel* (Ch.) et *Allègre*. *Mélanges Grecs*. Traduction des Oeuvres de l'Orateur Antiphon (Cucuel)—Une Scène des Grenouilles d'Aristophane (Allègre). 8vo. Paris. Leroux. 3 fcs.
- Goetzeler* (L.) *Observationes Herodianaë*. 8vo. 27 pp. Wurzburg, Stahl. 80 pf.
- Hagen* (P.) *Quaestiones Dioneae*. 8vo. v. 80 pp. Kiel. 1 Mk. 40
- Hennen*. *Eine Prüfung des Unterrichts in der alten Philologie an Deutschlands Hochschulen*. 8vo. 18 pp. Trier, Hennen. 1 Mk.
- Herodoti belli persici historiae scholarum in usum ed.* A. Holder. 12mo. xxiv. 305 pp. 5 maps. Vienna, Tempsky. Mk. 1, 80.
- *historiae rec.* A. Holder. Ed. Major. Vol. II. 12mo. 420 pp. Vienna, Tempsky. Mk. 4.
- Inscriptions inédites d'Afrique* extraites des papiers de L. Rénier par A. Cagnat. 8vo. Paris, Hachette. 3 fcs.
- Josephy* (K.) *Der oratorische Numerus bei Isokrates und Demosthenes mit Berücksichtigung der Lehren der alten Rhetoren*. 8vo. 141 pp. Zürich. 1 Mk. 20.
- Lackner* (W.) *De incursionibus a Gallis in Italiam factis*. Pars I. 4to. 26 pp. Königsberg. 1 Mk.
- Lédain*. *Épigraphie romaine du Poitou*. 8vo. Paris, Champion. 5 fcs.
- Lezius* (J.) *De Alexandri Magni expeditione indica quaestiones*. 8vo. 160 pp. Dorpat. 2 Mk.
- Loeschke* (G.) *Die westliche Giebelgruppe am Zeustempel zu Olympia*. 4to. 8 pp. Dorpat. 40 Pf.
- Lysiae orationes selectae*, mit Einleitungen, erklär. Index und Anhang aus Xenophon's griechische Geschichte. Für d. Schulgebrauch hrsg. von A. Weidner. 12mo. viii. 168 pp. Leipzig, Freytag. Mk. 1, 25.

- Marquardt* (J.) et *Mommsen* (Th.) *Manuel des antiquités romaines*. Vol. X. *De l'organisation financière chez les Romains*, par J. Marquardt: traduit sur la dixième édition allemande, par A. Vigé. 8vo. iv. 406 pp. Paris. Thorin. 10 fcs.
- Marschall* (K.) *De Q. Remmii Palaemonis libris grammaticis*. 8vo. 86 pp. Leipzig. 1 Mk. 80.
- Meiser* (K.) *Ueber historische Dramen der Römer*. 4to. 42 pp. Munich. 1 Mk.
- Nadrowski* (R.) *Neue Schlaglichter auf dunkeln Gebieten der griechischen und lateinischen Etymologie*. 2nd entirely revised edition. 8vo. v. 134 pp. Berlin. Issleib. 4 Mk.
- Pauli* (C.) *Altitalische Studien*. Part V. 8vo. iv. 161 pp. 2 plates. Hanover. Hahn. 8 Mk.
- Paulson* (J.) *Studia Hesiodica*. I. *De re metrica*. 8vo. Lund. 4 Mk.
- Reinach* (Sal.) *Antoine E.-E. Desjardins*. Olivier Rayet. Deux nécrologies. 8vo. 15 pp. Berlin. Calvary. 1 Mk. 20.
- Robert* (L.) et *Cagnat* (R.) *Épigraphie gallo-romaine de la Moselle*. 4to. Paris, Champion. 30 fcs.
- Schmidt* (A.) *Handbuch d. griech. Chronologie*. Hrsg. von F. Rühl. 8vo. lv. 804 pp. Jena, Fischer. Mk. 16.
- Schultze* (E.) *De legione Romanorum xiii. gemina*. 8vo. 114 pp. 1 map. Kiel. 3 Mk.
- Schulz* (J. G.) *Attische Verbalformen alphabetisch zusammengestellt auf Grund von Inschriften und Autoren*. 8vo. Prague, Storch. Mk. 1, 60.
- Sophoclis Oedipus Tyrannus*. In scholarum usum ed J. Holub. 8vo. viii. 52 pp. Vienna. Konegen. 60 Pf.
- Tissot* (Ch.) *Géographie comparée de la province romaine d'Afrique*. Vol. II. *Chorographie, réseau routier*. Publié par S. Reinach. 8vo. Paris, Hachette. 15 fcs.
- Vergil*. *Opera*. Scholarum in usum ed. W. Kloucek. Pars I. *Bucolica et Georgica*. Ed. maior. 12mo. vi. 100 pp. Vienna, Tempsky. Mk. 1, 20.
- Ed. minor. v. 27 pp. 70 Pf.
- Vergil*. *Des Aeneas Irrfahrt von Troja nach Karthago*. Uebersetzung des 1. und 3. Buches der Aeneis in Oktaven, nebst Einleitung, von K. Troost. 8vo. xx. 80 pp. 3 Mk. 20.
- *Berliner Studien*. Vol. vii. pt. 2.
- Wessely* (C.) *Griechische Zauberpapyrus von Paris und London*. 4to. 174 pp. Vienna. Tempsky. (*Extr.* Denkschr. d. k. Akad. d. Wiss.) 9 Mk. 20.
- Wlassak* (M.) *Römische Processgesetze*. Part I. 8vo. Leipzig, Düncker und Humboldt. 6 Mk.